

TODAY'S SPEECH

SEPTEMBER, 1959

50 Cents a Copy

\$1.50 a Year

Volume VII

Published Quarterly

Number 3

In This Issue

MAN'S OPINION	page 2
RHETORIC IN THE MINISTRY by John V. Bachman	page 3
THE LAWYER USES RHETORIC by Franklin R. Weiss	page 6
EL MARTIN PEARSON: 1871-1938 by Drew Pearson	page 9
MODERN POETRY AND A KAT CALLED KRAZY by Ralph Pomeroy	page 13
MORAL READING CAN BE FUN by Earl E. Fleischman	page 16
WE CALL IT GUTS by Frank E. Walser	page 19
ORGANIZING THE SPEECH TO INFORM by Phillip K. Tompkins	page 21
VISIT WITH JOHN BRIGHT by David M. Jabusch	page 22
ARCHING by Elton S. Carter	page 24
RHETORIC AND SEMANTICS by John D. Newman	page 28
CERTIFICATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS	page 33

Don't Miss

1. In the next issue:

"What Was that Name Again?" by William V. Shannon; "Conversation Spoilers," by Joseph Lebo; "The Importance of Speech," by Fred L. Casmir; "Cyclops at the Lectern," by Robert B. Kaplan; "Three C's of Great Speaking," by Ralph Adams Brown; "The Bar X Speech Corral," by Loretta Wagner Smith and Robin Taylor; and half a dozen more that represent the wide range of our interest in Speech.

2. *A History of the Speech Association of the Eastern States*, by Dr. Herbert A. Wichelns, Cornell University, pp. 17, \$1.00. An account of the men and movements of the first 50 years of our SAES.

3. *Re-Establishing the Speech Profession: The First Fifty Years*, ed. by Robert T. Oliver and Marvin G. Bauer, pp. 104, \$1.50. Twenty outstanding experts in varied areas of Speech write the history of what has happened to our profession since its re-emergence from the blight of the Elocutionary Era. Invaluable for study and reference.

Order from:

Wiley C. Bowyer, Ex-Sec., SAES
Mineola Public Schools
Mineola, L. I., N. Y.

Speech Is Civilization -- Silence Isolates

One Man's Opinion

We always have reason to feel good when our articles are reprinted.

"The Decline and Fall of Persuasion in Sales Training," by Dr. George A. Field, Wayne State University, which was in our September, 1958, issue, has been reprinted twice: in *Sales Review*, February, 1959, under the title, "Don't Forget Persuasion," and in the *Advertiser's Digest*, March, 1959. The article on "Speech in the Senate," by Phillip A. Tompkins and Wilmer A. Linkugel, of the University of Kansas, which appeared in our issue for February, 1959, became the subject of a May 26 Associated Press dispatch, under the provocative heading, "No Daniel Websters." It was also inserted in the May 21, 1959, issue of *The Congressional Record*, on pp. A4286-87. *Toastmaster Magazine* has requested permission to reprint Ralph Schmidt's "Common Speech Practices that Annoy Audiences" (from our April, 1959, issue).

Dr. Dominick A. Barbara, M. D., a New York City psychiatrist, has produced a second book based on his series of articles in *TODAY'S SPEECH*. The first, *Your Speech Reveals Your Personality*, (\$5.50) appeared in 1958, published by Charles C. Thomas, Springfield, Illinois. The second, same price, same publisher, is *The Art of Listening*, which appeared early this year. In it Dr. Barbara unfolds the factors of emotional stress and unconscious motivation that make us good listeners, or bad, and that directs the kind and degree

of attention we give to various kinds of speech and speakers. Not wearied by these two extensive writing jobs accomplished within less than two years, Dr. Barbara is currently editing another volume, with a score of contributors chosen primarily from the membership of the Speech Association of the Eastern States, dealing with various aspects of the psychology of speech.

Another of our contributors, Dr. John D. Mitchell, who has made extensive studies of the theatre of Europe, has opened recently in New York a non-profit, privately-endowed Institute for Advanced Studies in the Theatre Arts, which will be devoted to consideration of such foreign acting, directing, and staging techniques as those of London's Old Vic, the Moscow Art Theatre, the Japanese Kabuki Theatre, and the Parisian Comedie Francaise.

We shall look forward to more articles from all these writers; indeed, one of them, Mr. Tompkins, is represented again in this issue. We are equally interested in receiving contributions from new writers — however inexperienced. It is our editorial view that "good writing consists of saying something of value, clearly, simply, and with consideration for the needs of the readers." No one who can meet this test need (in our view) to consider that he is "no writer." There is indeed a magic about good writing — but it derives very largely from having something significant to say.

Published by the Speech Association of the Eastern States

TODAY'S SPEECH — Volume VII, Number 3 — September, 1959

PAUL D. HOLTZMAN, PRESIDENT, SAES	<i>The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa.</i>
WILEY C. BOWYER, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, SAES	<i>Mineola Public Schools, Mineola, L.I., N.Y.</i>
ROBERT T. OLIVER, EDITOR	<i>The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa.</i>
THOBURN V. BARKER, BUSINESS MANAGER	<i>Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa.</i>
KATHRYN DEBOER, CIRCULATION MANAGER	<i>The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa.</i>

TODAY'S SPEECH is published quarterly in February, April, September, and November, by the Speech Association of the Eastern States. Subscriptions provided with membership in SAES (\$3.50 annually): apply to the Executive Secretary. Subscriptions to non-members, \$1.50 yearly. Advertising rates on request. Entered as second-class matter at the post office at State College, Pa., under the act of March 3, 1897. Please send notice on Form 3587 and return copies under label Form 3597 to *TODAY'S SPEECH*, 305 Sparks Bldg., The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa.

SPONSOR'S MEMBERSHIP, \$7.50 annually

Rhetoric in the Ministry

by John V. Bachman

Dr. Bachman, well-known in church circles for leadership in radio, television, and audio-visual education, was formerly Assoc. Prof. of Speech and is now Professor of Practical Theology in Union Theological Seminary.

THE THOUGHTFUL MINISTER REGARDS RHETORIC as both essential and suspect. He welcomes its insights but is on guard against its possible perversions. This means, of course, that like ancient and modern rhetoricians he is discriminating rather than uncritical in his adoption of principles. But the minister's reservations are theological as well as Socratic in origin, and I shall try to keep this distinctive problem in view at all times in discussing "Rhetoric in the Ministry."

For convenience in analysis I shall use the three loose categories which keep bobbing up and down through the centuries: (1) the personal qualifications of the speaker; (2) the power of working on the character and emotions of the audience; and (3) persuasive argumentation; or the speaker, the audience and the argument.

I

First, then, the character or qualifications of the speaker. In most of his public speaking the minister is not essentially an actor engaging in imitation nor a scholar reporting his findings but a witness proclaiming. "That which we have seen and hear, declare we unto you." This is testimony in its genuine, uncorrupted sense, and to have meaning it must come out of a background of great integrity.

A minister who is characterized by this integrity may be an effective speaker, especially to congregations who know him, despite the fact that his speaking style may fail to measure up to any of the principles advocated in Speech textbooks.

Once in an opening class session I played tape recorded extracts from sermons of three different preachers and invited the students to submit written comments concerning their style of delivery. The preachers were not identified and each was unknown to all but one or two members of the class. One of the men recorded was Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, who thoroughly enjoyed a few of the written comments when he later heard about them. Here are several:

"This speaker is evidently a fundamentalist."
"This speaker should stop preaching and become

conscious of his teacher role." "He would be offensive to a sophisticated audience." "His expression of ideas is juvenile and elementary" — and this student misspelled juvenile!

For persons who know Dr. Fosdick or know about him his style is natural and animated; they associate with his voice their knowledge of his courage and scholarship and they listen receptively. For persons who do not know him his style apparently does not win a hearing, at least at the outset, and it does not do justice to what he has to say.

We must face squarely up to the implications of this in considering the place of rhetoric in the ministry. (I am including delivery in rhetoric, as did the ancients, and am not separating voice and diction from public address, as do many moderns.) How important is delivery in revealing the integrity of the personality? It is not a new question, and Cicero's conclusion is still good. In comparing the philosopher who is unable to speak with the orator who is ignorant he has observed, "If I had to choose one of the two, I should prefer uneloquent good sense to loquacious folly. But if it be inquired which is the more eminent excellence, the palm is to be given to the learned orator."

Many young people preparing for the ministry today stop short of his final statement. They have observed in several of the profound preachers of this generation uneloquent good sense; and they favor it over the loquacious folly of certain other "popular preachers," who in becoming celebrities call attention to themselves instead of to God, despite their verbal disclaimers. These young people are also likely to shy away from eloquence because of its association with exaggeration and artificiality in contemporary commercialized popular culture.

I am not suggesting that this reluctance to be fully expressive is universal nor that when it exists it is always conscious or even honest. In some instances a person escapes from the demanding discipline of rhetoric by rationalizing that it is not academically respectable anyway. In other cases an overly restrained style or a monotonous pattern may be symptomatic of deep personal disturbances.

A speaker may not sound convincing primarily because he is unconvinced.

The recognition of diagnostic possibilities in delivery must not lead us to uncritical and absolute acceptance of the reverse of the principle. Just because some speakers reveal their anxieties and tensions in their delivery, it does not follow that every speaker with integrity and conviction will inevitably and automatically have an effective delivery. I suppose we have all known instances where a person has had a clear orientation, a deep commitment and a genuine desire to communicate, but his oral expression of this desire is false rather than faithful because he has never learned the proper use of his marvelous vocal instrument.

Some ministers even attempt to de-personalize their delivery as an expression of their "priestly" function. There is a place in certain traditions for the liturgical chant, which suggests the heritage of the ages, but there is a place in all traditions for preaching which includes an element of witness and which involves the communicator. Except for the conduct of liturgical worship, it is very doubtful whether it is desirable or even possible for a person to achieve a de-personalization in his delivery. An exaggerated emphasis on interpretation is usually a delusion.

This is the point where I find it possible to make contact with many ministers who have been conditioned against the disciplines involved in cultivating good habits of speech. They are often intrigued by the symbolic complications which arise when the verbal becomes auditory. They see that there is an inescapable relationship between form and content. As soon as verbal symbols are voiced they acquire additional, significant connotations; they are colored by the voice and the choice of coloring should be deliberate rather than accidental.

The lugubrious articulation of a joyous passage of scripture is as much of a distortion as would be a false translation. What the minister intends to make sound like the "heritage of the ages" may sound for this generation more like a demonstration of "tired blood."

I remember a radio station manager who once told me that in hiring announcers he selected men who could take a laundry list and make it sound like a declaration of war. In their reasonable aversion to such practices, ministers sometimes end by taking a declaration of peace and making it sound like a laundry list.

Ministers, then, must realize that development of effective delivery is essentially a matter of their being faithful to themselves and to their message. It must be made clear that this aspect of rhetoric

is not a technique for putting up a front but an effort to help a person express himself as he is, to convey an accurate revelation of his personal qualifications, his integrity.

II

The second of our categories—the power of working on the characters and emotions of the audience—also calls forth a ministerial ambivalence.

There is obvious significance in it. Both the Jewish and Christian faiths see man in his wholeness. The so-called rational is only one element of man's total being; the emotional life is equally essential. Judaism and Christianity have historical, existential roots. At the heart of both religions are events and encounters, personal relationships, and not simply principles, creeds and ontological abstractions. The theologian understands Cicero when he maintains that mankind makes far more determination "through hatred or love, or desire, or anger, or grief, or joy, or hope, or fear, or error, or some other affection of mind, than regard to truth, or any settled maxim, or principle of right, or adherence to laws."

But the theologian also shares Plato's reservations, expressed in his attack on Sophistical rhetoric as "no guide to truth but well-fitted to delude the credulous and ignorant." He regards any form of exploitation or manipulation as a violation of human integrity. He believes that God Himself does not force Himself upon His creatures but respects the free will with which He has endowed them. He asks with Socrates, "Do the rhetoricians appear to you always to speak with a view to what is the best, aiming at this, that the citizens may be made as good as possible by their discourses? Or do they, too, endeavor to gratify the citizens, and neglecting the public interest for the sake of their own private advantage, do they treat the people as children, trying only to gratify them, without being in the least concerned with whether they should become better or worse by these means?"

Thus the thoughtful minister is suspicious of irresponsible attempts to "win friends and influence people" through indiscriminate appeals to their motives and urges.

What is known as motivational research is simply a logical extension of the principles enunciated in many Speech textbooks; and the minister is encouraged when someone like Perrin Stryker in *Fortune* magazine raises some ethical questions, among them the question "whether any manufacturer should exploit, as buying motives, the deepest human frailties that can be dug out by psycho-analytic methods . . . Fears about non-conformity, anxiety over security, narcissism, reluctance to face

up to some of the disagreeable but necessary chores of life, excessive emulation of the Joneses — these and other signs of immaturity motivational research has unquestionably revealed, but the real trouble is not that they are exposed but that motivational research often seems to recommend, openly or implicitly, that United States business nourish these weaknesses and pander to them."

The uncomfortable but persistent theological concept of sin makes ministers so aware of the dimensions of human frailties that they are most reluctant to pander to them.

I must confess immediately, however, that I am referring to the more thoughtful ministers. There are, of course, some who are among the worst offenders in terms of manipulation, who distort religion to make it appear to offer an easy answer to all questions, and a painless solution to all problems. But this "positive thinking" route to conformism and escapism, this reduction of men to happy cabbages, is obviously unworthy of the prophetic Jewish and Christian tradition.

Purged of the elements of manipulation, appeals to the emotions of the audience are justifiable to the extent that they are authentic. In many circumstances it would be at least as much falsification to eliminate them as to exaggerate them. I remember some years ago when a town where I had once lived, Waco, Texas, suffered a devastating tornado. Naturally I read all of the accounts about the disaster. One magazine article began with a sentence something like this, "It is difficult to exclude emotion from a report of what happened when the tornado struck." In such circumstances it is not only difficult but it is impossible and nonsensical.

In his pastoral work the minister learns to participate in the situation of his people, experiencing vicariously their needs, hopes, and dilemmas. He must relate to these conditions without abdicating to them. He must participate without capitulating. This requires discrimination.

III

The third aspect of rhetoric which I wish to relate to the ministry must again be viewed from a dialectical perspective. Persuasive argumentation is both useful and inadequate for the minister. It is useful because faith is not the antithesis of reason, because men's minds do operate according to observable principles and because God confronts man with difficult choices and calls upon him for decisions. By itself it is an inadequate approach to truth, but it can be supplemented and corrected by poetic and dramatic apprehensions of reality.

The problem is whether the Gospel sets a standard higher than men can aspire to reach.

Paul, who more than any other early Christian tried to be all things to all men, acquired a keen awareness of the "foolishness of preaching." The essence of the minister's proclamation is one of reconciliation — the announcement that man can be restored to a relationship which is the very purpose of his existence — "Thou has made us for Thyself and our hearts are restless till they rest in Thee" — but there is a real question as to how adequately persuasive argumentation expresses such ultimate values, and there is a bigger question as to the predictable effectiveness of the communicative attempt.

Hendrik Kraemer says flatly that, "the best communication does not necessarily guarantee 'success.' The search for successful communication has no Biblical justification; only the search for faithful, really interpretative communication has." This sounds very much like Quintilian, who said that "the purpose of oratory is not to persuade but to speak well irrespective of consequences."

This could lead to a total lack of concern for reason, order or clarity, but Paul Tillich rounds out the view when he says, "There is always a genuine decision against the gospel for those for whom it is a stumbling block. But this decision should not be dependent upon the wrong stumbling block, namely the wrong way of our communication of the gospel — our inability to communicate. What we have to do is to overcome the wrong stumbling block in order to bring people face to face with the right stumbling block and enable them to make a genuine decision."

Here then in the use of persuasive argumentation, as in the projection of one's personality through appropriate delivery and in the legitimate appeal to emotions, the minister must exercise critical judgment and subject himself to rigorous discipline.

If he is reluctant to do so it may help him to recall the experience of Paul with Eutychus. Paul, you remember, preached so long and with such evident disregard for rhetorical principles that the young man Eutychus went to sleep, fell out of the window and was "taken up for dead." Then Paul went to him and restored him to life. I have always thought that he was a little late; I wish he had taken an earlier interest in Eutychus so that the boy might not have fallen out of the window in the first place. All ministers profess a deep concern for their congregations. One measure of their sincerity is a willingness to devote themselves to rhetorical discipline which can truly serve the needs of the congregation.

How the Lawyer Uses Rhetoric

by Franklin R. Weiss

A partner in the New York City law firm of Levine and Weiss, Mr. Weiss was active in speech contests in high school, majored in Speech at Queens College, and held a graduate fellowship in Speech at Queens while pursuing his law degree at Brooklyn Law School.

SELDOM DO WE FIND IN ANYTHING unanimity of opinion. Seldom do the ancients agree with the moderns, the educator with the business man, the business man with the theologian, the theologian with the journalist.

As a lawyer I would have to say that this disagreement is as it should be; but in one small but important matter there does seem to be almost unanimous opinion; and that opinion is that lawyers, attorneys, counsellors-at-law, barristers, solicitors, advocates are necessary evils.

This is *not* as it should be.

Even Luke in the New Testament had it in for us when he wrote: "Woe unto you also, ye lawyers, for ye laden men with burdens grievous to be borne, and ye, yourselves, touch not the burdens with one of your fingers."

And there is another topic which has had its share of disrepute and malignment — a topic in which we all share the greatest interest, rhetoric, the art of bringing to bear the available means of persuasion.

I

May I therefore suggest that the first relationship of rhetoric and law is that they are thrown together and attacked as one by their defamers.

Plato states his case against rhetoric through Socrates: "But if my enemy injures a third person, then in every sort of way, by word as well as deed, I should try to prevent his being punished or appearing before the judge; and if he appears I should contrive that he should escape, and not suffer punishment: if he has stolen a sum of money, let him keep what he has stolen and spend it on him and his, regardless of religion and justice; and if he has done things worthy of death, let him not die, but rather be immortal in his wickedness; or if this is not possible, let him at any rate be allowed to live as long as he can. For such purposes rhetoric may be useful, but it is of small if of any use to him who is not intending to commit injustice."

Please remember that Plato's position was an ideal one: He was in this dialogue the prosecutor,

defense counsel and key witness; and he is presently unavailable for cross-examination.

Let me respectfully take exception, as we lawyers say, to this learned gentleman. I have done some of the things he has mentioned; I have always used the principles and practices of rhetoric as often and as well as I know how; and I have never intended an injustice.

To say that rhetoric in itself is evil is to say that a hammer is a weapon of death, that fire is only a destructive force. Rhetoric is an instrument, a tool, and is one of the very few tools available to an attorney in his daily life of advocacy.

Aristotle deals in his *Rhetoric* with analysis of the attitudes and desires of mankind. He places great emphasis on the nature of the men to be persuaded.

In the life of an attorney very often the "men to be persuaded" sit upon that incalculable entity — a jury. Our system of law is based on the premise that a man has the right to be judged by his peers. The selection of those peers — the picking of a jury, as we call it, can mean the winning or losing of a trial. In many situations the attorney about to try a case has a certain limited right to determine who will sit on a jury. Since we are given the opportunity to select our audience, we certainly want a group which can judge fairly, if not one that will judge favorably.

A few years ago I assisted in the preparation of the defense of a chiropractor accused of practicing medicine without a license. In analyzing the probabilities of the case we came to the conclusion that certain types or classes of people would be prone to resolve issues against our client. Those people were not chosen on the jury.

The law says that a man is presumed innocent until proven guilty. This, however, is a premise upon which I prefer not to rely too heavily. Sometimes the law on the library shelves is barely recognizable in the court room.

We felt that any man who practiced his profession by virtue of a franchise or license would resolve doubts against some one like this chiro-

practor accused of impinging on the medical profession. They would do this as a matter of self-protection and self-righteousness. Those who had professionals in the family, and those closely associated with professionals would feel similarly. As a matter of probability we wanted the whole upper economic strata to be excluded from the jury. Although there were to be only 12 men and women on the jury, the 12 would be chosen from a list of 200 names drawn by the county clerk. I investigated all of the 200 possible people as to their occupation, economic circumstances and political affiliation, so that regardless of which 12 people would be chosen, I would have information sufficient to assess the probabilities of their opinion toward this mal-practice problem. If a potential juror did not appear suitable we would then try to challenge him off the jury.

II

A lawyer once wrote that the trial of a case begins 1,000 yards from the courtroom steps. I respectfully submit that at that point a trial is half over. An important part of a trial is the work of preparation. Not the science, not the art, but the *work* of preparation. Preparation of a case for trial, or what would be equivalent to the Roman *inventio* and *dispositio* in preparation for a forensic speech, is important; particularly the gathering of material is crucial. The argument of a case calls specifically for a marshalling and arranging of all the facts and all the applicable law.

Recently a criminal proceeding was instituted against a client of mine for larceny, in which it was alleged by the complainant that my client, while repossessing a boat, stole valuable equipment from that boat. Testimony was adduced to show that the equipment was still on the boat when it came into my client's custody and control. Relying not so much on my client's integrity and honesty, but rather on the probability that his good business sense would disincline him from such a blatant larceny. I investigated the matter thoroughly. I obtained the serial numbers of the radio and other equipment alleged to have been stolen and had them checked against police department reports of stolen property and against claims made to insurance companies. I discovered that many months before the alleged larceny, before my client came into the picture, the complainant had placed a claim with his insurance company for some of the items as having been stolen from his boat.

The discovery of this very material fact governed my conduct in the trial. The complainant took the stand and stated his case in a very convincing manner. As I cross-examined, I assisted

the complainant in re-stating his case. I made it easy for him to call my client a thief. I helped him to tell us again what items were stolen and what their value was. His confidence climbed. He was positive, he was boisterous. He was self-righteous. "How them," I asked, "could you have placed a claim for the theft of these items with your insurance company almost six months ago? You did place such a claim and collect on it, didn't you?" The golden silence that followed was all the answer the judge needed. His Honor directed the complainant to answer, and he answered in the affirmative. There was a brief but heated dialogue regarding the criminal offense of perjury, and the charge against my client was dismissed.

Then, of course, regardless of the preparation an attorney has made, there will always be something new and unexpected at the trial, and he must be ever alert to adapt his rhetoric to the immediate circumstances.

A few months ago, I defended a man in an assault case. He was paying a late night visit to another man's wife, when the husband unexpectedly returned home. My client met this classic situation with his fists and, adding bodily injury to the moral insult, put hubby in the hospital for a few days.

In the trial my client was convicted and a date set for sentencing. Back in the office I interviewed my client diligently regarding his past, trying to find a basis for a plea of leniency.

He had been raised in an orphan home, and at the age of 15 he ran away. Being out on the streets in this large city without food for two days, he stole a woman's hand-bag in the hope of finding money for food, and found instead a jail sentence. This sounded fine, and I prepared my address to the judges of Special Sessions on the basis of his sad childhood, a lack of love, the hardship, and the plea that this offense would never be repeated.

In court on the day of sentencing, five minutes before the case was to be called, the district attorney came over to me and showed me my client's *official* history. The only word of truth my client had confided to me was that his first offense was indeed at the tender age of 15. But it wasn't petty larceny; it was grand larceny, and he spent three years in the penitentiary for it. Then within a year after he was out of jail, he was convicted of armed robbery and of fighting a running-gun battle with the New Brunswick, New Jersey police, for which he received and served another three years. Needless to say, I hastily revised the emphasis of my appeal. I told how for a *full five years* he was in no trouble; that he had just begun a new business

which would collapse in his absence, taking with it all his life's savings. Instead of going to jail, which perhaps might have been his just reward, he received only a small fine.

III

One of the most difficult concepts for the lay mind to grasp is that law, like rhetoric, deals with probabilities. I was two years into law school before I understood this. I used to read cases and statutes looking for right and wrong, truth and untruth. I worked hard trying to find absolutes, until I gradually realized that they didn't exist in the field. As lawyers we are concerned, as Aristotle put it, with the probability of the occurrence of past facts, with the possibility of the occurrence of future facts, with the greatness or smallness of things. Beginning with this idea as a premise, we can understand that the lawyer's job is to discover and use the proofs available to him, to establish the probabilities.

The lawyer is constantly proving. When the client walks into my office, I as a lawyer must prove my interest, my sincerity, my knowledge. I must prove to the client that the course of action I advise is the best; that his neighbor's idea is not the best. We all have neighbors who have had the identical experience and know the right steps to take. We prove as we negotiate, and we prove at the trial, if there be one, or at the consummation of the transaction, and after all is over we must prove to our clients that the modest remuneration requested is small payment indeed for our achievements in his behalf.

One of the methods of proof studied through the ages is ethical proof—what a man is, what he appears to be, what he stands for, are strong considerations in the collective mind of a jury. The ethics of a lawyer is a powerful means of persuasion. Regardless of logical and emotional proof presented, there are many cases won because the jury liked the lawyer or did not like the other lawyer. Credibility of witnesses and litigants are legitimate considerations in the mind of a jury. The conclusion about a person and his cause is very often formed because of a feeling the jury had. It may sound base and strange to say that I have learned from Aristotle that before going to court for an accused juvenile delinquent, my client must first make a stop at the barber shop.

There are many aspects of ethical proof that militate against the lawyer in his day in court, defending an unpopular cause or a person accused of a noxious crime, or where the circumstances are suspicious. We have too often heard the question

before the trial, before the evidence is in, why does this lawyer defend a guilty man?

The question is raised: how can an honest lawyer defend or represent a cause in which he cannot possibly believe? It is a constant source of amazement to me as a lawyer how little the lay public understands about the duties and responsibilities of an attorney-at-law. Can you picture yourself, not the man sitting next to you, but you, being accused of a crime, and as the wheels of justice pull you into its strange entanglements, you are unable to secure a lawyer who will believe you, to speak for you, to defend you, to tell your side of the story. I personally think that it is a horrifying nightmare, and believe me when I say that honest and innocent people are every day drawn by innocuous circumstances into excruciating and life-upsetting events. It is only the lawyer who can untangle these events.

Lloyd Paul Stryker in his wonderful book *The Art of Advocacy* cites Boswell's question, and Doctor Samuel Johnson's answer on the topic. Boswell asked, "but what do you think of supporting a cause which you know to be bad?" Johnson answered, "Sir, you do not know it to be good or bad till the judge determines it. I have said that you are to state facts fairly; so that your thinking on what you call knowing a cause to be bad must be from reasoning; must be from supposing your arguments to be weak and inconclusive. But, sir, that is not enough. An argument which does not convince yourself may convince the judge to whom you urge it; and if it does convince him, sir, you are wrong and he is right. It is his business to be judge; and you are not to be confident in your own opinion that a cause is bad but to say all you can for your client, and then hear the judge's opinion."

IV

Of course what a man is or has done does not alone prove the case. Logical argument and emotion play their part.

As Mr. Dooley said, back at the turn of the century: "Thank th' Lord, whin the case is all over, the jury'll pitch the tistimony out iv the window an' consider three questions: Did Lootgert look as though he'd kilt his wife? Did his wife look as though she ought to be kilt? Isn't it time we wint to supper?"

Or consider another of Mr. Dooley's remarks: "If a lawyer thinks his client is innocent he talks to the jury about the crime. But if he knows where the pris'ner hid the plunder, he unfurls the flag,

(Continued on page 15)

Paul Martin Pearson: 1871 - 1938

by Drew Pearson

The famous Washington columnist, known around the world, came to the Golden Jubilee Convention of the SAES last April and delivered this tribute to his father—who is known everywhere in Speech circles as the founder of the oldest existing Speech professional society and the first editor of the first modern Speech journal.

I AM THE POOREST PERSON CONCEIVABLE to talk about the founder of the Speech Association of the Eastern States, for two reasons:

1. Although I studied long and diligently under my father, he despaired of my ever becoming a public speaker.

2. I will give you a very prejudiced story.

Furthermore, I suspect it is a mistake to take anyone who has been close to the art of filibustering in Washington and then turn him loose on the subject of one he loved. I was a boy in knee breeches when your Speech Association was born in 1909. I can't tell you very much about the actual birth pains. But I can tell you about the man who served as mid-wife.

I

He was born on a farm near Litchfield, Illinois, on October 22, 1871. His father was a tenant farmer who had recently come back from the Civil War and who, when he could not make a go of farming, moved, when my father was about six years old, by prairie schooner to Cherryvale, Kansas. There my father graduated from the Cherryvale, Kansas, High School in 1887 at the age of fifteen. His commencement oration was "Pontius Pilate." Four years later he graduated from Baker University at the age of nineteen, the youngest of the class of twenty-one. I might mention in passing that his tuition and complete expenses for the freshman year totaled \$185.00. Board during his entire four years in college averaged \$1.80 a week. His first job was teaching at Cherryvale, Kansas—salary \$50.00 a month; and during that first summer he gave his first lecture recital on James Whitcomb Riley. His net receipts for the summer were \$30.00, which he divided fifty-fifty with his agent, Ben Powell.

For the next two years the founder of your Association served as a circuit minister in eastern

Kansas, buried the dead, married the young, served as a sort of physician. He also taught school and struggled toward his real ambition—to become a public speaker. To fulfill that ambition he went to the Northwestern University School of Speech in Evanston, Illinois, and during that summer, filled his first Chautauqua engagement at Palmer Lake, Colorado. The fee was railroad fare from Pueblo, plus whatever he could make from teaching private classes. Shortly thereafter at Parsons, Kansas, he married the lady who became my mother, and one year later, in 1897, while he was teaching at Northwestern, I came into the world.

There followed three years teaching at Northwestern School of Speech, and one year at Harvard in graduate study. In 1901 the family moved to the little Pennsylvania town which was to become our home for many years, Swarthmore, where father taught in the department of English. But always ambitious to push on to wider public speaking fields, he shortly formed the department of public speaking and remained head of that department for many years.

Those were the days long before radio, television, or motion pictures, when personal speech had a great deal to do with moulding the thought of the nation. Probably the greatest impact on America after the church and the school came from the Chautauqua and the Lyceum. The Chautauqua, as you know, had received its name from Lake Chautauqua in New York and from this Methodist camp meeting on the shores of the Lake there had sprung a whole series of one-week meetings in various parts of the Middle West, which finally grew into the Chautauqua circuit. In those days no town held its head high unless it brought Chautauqua to its community for at least one week. Some communities financed a Chautauqua for two weeks or even thirty days.

During his early years as a teacher of Speech, Paul Pearson had spent every summer in the Mid-

dle West, augmenting his income and perhaps improving his abilities before Chautauqua audiences. I remember some very lonesome summers for my mother when her family, consisting of two ram-functious boys, lived alone while the founder of your Association tried to meet the family budget by filling summer engagements.

I find a notation in the records that he kept that in 1902 he filled a speaking engagement at Lock Haven Pennsylvania Normal School, where the fee was \$50.00. And there occurred this notation: "A long looked-for addition to the straitened family purse. The only paid date between January and June. The most profitable date, he added, "was a no-fee engagement for the district meeting of the Woman's Club, which resulted in six engagements at other clubs the next season, when a \$20 fee was collected."

I also find this notation: "The summer engagements began with a month at Middlebury College, Vermont, where the lecture recital on Edgar Allan Poe was prepared, committed and rehearsed. In that recital 'Ulalume' proved the most difficult to properly present. This was included only two or three times during the summer, but thereafter was omitted from the recital. I still cherish the belief that I can sometime so master that poem that I can make an audience like it."

In the year 1904 Paul Pearson decided that those who practice the profession of Speech needed a magazine to represent them and he took over the editorship of "Talent, a magazine of the Lyceum." One year later he branched out into a quarterly magazine called "The Speaker," a collection of poems and prose readings for libraries and public speaking teachers.

II

It was this determination to make the art of speaking increasingly important to the American people that led in 1909 to the formation of your Speech Association. My father by that time had become identified with the lecture-recital, which combined the reading of poetry with the interpretation of poetry. His lecture recitals include one on American humorists—Mark Twain, James Whitcomb Riley, Artemus Ward, Bill Nye, Mr. Dooley, Joel Chandler Harris and Eugene Field.

Another was entitled "Greater American Poets" and included Poe, Longfellow, Walt Whitman, Lowell, Emerson and Sidney Lanier. Another was entitled "Contemporary Drama," including Percy McKaye's "The Scarecrow," Maurice Maeterlinck's "The Bluebird," Josephine Preston Peabody's "The Piper," and Edmond Rostand's "Chantecler." And

there were many others—one on Tennyson, Kipling, a lecture called "The Joy of Living." I suppose father delivered this lecture just as often as Russell Conwell delivered his famous lecture, "Acres of Diamonds."

I cannot tell you much about the founding of the Eastern Public Speaking Conference, as it was then called, except that it grew from a meeting at Swarthmore College three years earlier, attended by public speaking teachers in that area. They decided to edit and publish *The Public Speaking Review*, which was later given the name *Speech*, and from this conference developed your Association.

The year 1909 was chiefly vivid in my memory because of an entirely different event—namely, my father purchased a spring wagon and two horses in Columbus, Ohio, and drove his family east from his series of western speaking engagements to Swarthmore, Pennsylvania. The 450-mile trip took us three weeks. We camped out every night and passed only three automobiles during that entire time. Today on that same route you will pass perhaps three automobiles every minute.

I am sure that one factor which motivated my father in founding the Eastern Public Speaking Conference was the fact that the Chautauqua, Lyceum, and the art of public speaking generally seemed to have by-passed the East. It was highly developed in the Middle West. But public speaking at that time was not even taught to any great extent in Eastern colleges. Northwestern University in Evanston was then the mecca for those who wanted to study public speaking.

III

It was partly because of this Eastern void that in the year 1910, shortly after the founding of your Association, my father began trying to bring the Chautauquas East. It was not until 1912 that he finally managed to launch a three-week circuit in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland and Delaware. It took a considerable amount of capital and loans from all his friends to finance the tents, folding chairs, and pay the salaries of the speakers. The Chautauqua was never a great financial success; my father borrowed on almost everything he had to put across that first struggling circuit.

However, the Swarthmore Chautauquas, as they were called, eventually grew until there were three main circuits and two five-day circuits, extending all through eastern Canada and as far south as North Carolina. They carried great impact on the communities, and featured such noted speakers as

William Jennings Bryan, William Howard Taft the senior Bob La Follette and many others.

I remember vividly the days when Bryan spoke on Chautauqua as Secretary of State. He was subject to great criticism by Republican newspapers for augmenting his Cabinet salary. The Cabinet salary, however, was low at that time and Bryan had no law firm, no personal expense fund of \$18,000. He was a poor man. He made his trips from Washington only to nearby towns, from which he could get back the next day. I remember that as a tent boy I always went out of my way to get a pitcher of water for the Secretary of State. For others I supplied only a bucket of water and a dipper. I remember also being about a block from the tent in Towson, Maryland, one night as Bryan was speaking. It was a clear night, the walls of the tent were rolled up and I could hear him one block away. There was no loud speaker system in those days. Bryan carried his own microphone in his own chest. You had to have a chest and a powerful pair of lungs in that day in order to be a public speaker.

I remember also one July day at Galeton, Pennsylvania, in 1914. Bryan was scheduled to speak. I was a member of the tent crew and Bryan did not come. We heard rather vaguely that a member of a royal family in a little town in Sarajevo had been assassinated. No one knew anything about the town or the assassination. We only knew that this had interfered with the ability of the Secretary of State to keep his engagement. Little did we know in those days of relative American isolation that this event was to lead to one of the most tragic wars in history.

Bryan's fee at that time was \$250, plus one-half of the gate receipts. The Republican papers considered it exorbitant. Looking back I have always considered it modest. Since that time I've become something of a student of Washington. I know something about what goes on behind the scenes to augment certain Senators' salaries. I would rather have the Secretary of State fill a few speaking engagements publicly to inform the American people and get a modest remuneration for it, than have a wealthy man serve as Secretary of State or one who is indebted to his law firm.

It was about this time that my father introduced on the Swarthmore Chautauquas a series of three religious speakers. Dr. Stephen S. Wise, the noted rabbi, then relatively unknown; Dr. S. Parks Cadman of Brooklyn, also then unknown; and Father John Ryan, of the National Catholic Welfare Council. It was father's belief that there should be better understanding between members

of all religious faiths and he arranged a schedule whereby each of these three speakers appeared on three consecutive days. Significantly, there was considerable objection in the eastern part of the United States to Father Ryan. We have come a long way since 1914. But Father Ryan, a great Catholic and a great pioneer of a new social philosophy among lay Catholics, was objected to by some. My father, a Quaker, wanted him to be heard and in the end he was heard.

I remember also how my father persuaded William Howard Taft, who had just retired as President of the United States, to speak on the Chautauqua circuit. Taft, like most Presidents, was hard up. He had spent his own money in the White House. Father paid him what was then the largest fee in history, \$4,000 a week. Taft was a very uninspiring speaker and I'm not sure that he earned his fee, but you don't often have an ex-President of the United States — or didn't at that time — going out to appear before small towns of one or two thousand population.

IV

During this period, the founder of your Association continued not only as the organizer and director of this vast circuit of tent Chautauquas but also as a speaker. His talks or lecture recitals featured the inspirational and the lyrical. Running through the poems he gave his audiences there was always the note of determination and cheer. One of his favorites was "How Did You Die?" by Edmond Vance Cook. You may remember the lines:

"Did you tackle the trouble that came your way with a resolute heart and cheerful, or hide your face from the light of the day with a craven soul and fearful?"

He loved Kipling's "If." And at a very early age I learned those memorable lines: "If you can keep your head when all about you are losing theirs and blaming it on you."

And there was one poem which my mother detested. I can tell you that my wife detests it now. It was called "Work," and it began:

"Work!

Thank God for the might of it,
The ardor, the urge, the delight of it —
Work that springs from the heart's desire,
Setting the soul and the brain on fire.
Oh, what is so good as the heat of it,
Oh, what is so great as the beat of it,
And what is so kind as the stern command
Challenging brain and heart and hand?"

But there were also such famous lyrical poems that father loved as Tennyson's:

The splendor falls on castle walls
and snowy summits old in story;
The long light shakes across the lakes,
And the wild cataract leaps in glory.
Blow, bugle, blow, set the wild echoes flying,
Blow, bugle; answer, echoes, dying, dying,
dying.

And there was Alfred Noyes's lyrical beauty,
"There's a barrel-organ carolling across a
golden street

In the City as the sun sinks low:
And the music's not immortal; but the world
has made it sweet and fulfilled it with the
sunset glow.

And he helped to bring Joel Chandler Harris's famous "Brer Rabbit" rimes on "Brer Tarrypin" to countless audiences. You will remember the lines:

"Brer Tarrypin tired er prom'nadin' roun',
An' he lay in de sun right flat on de groun';
His foots wuz col', an' his eyes wuz red,
An't look like sump'n done bunged up his head;
But he watch Brer Buzzard a-sailin' in de sky,
An' he wisht fum his heart dat he could fly —
Fil-a-ma-looner-leener! fil-a-ma-leener-li!

There were also some poems written about my father. Here are two of them.

DID YOU?

Did you ever feel blue,
A dark indigo blue,
From the crown of your head
To your toes, through and through?
Did you frown when the birds
Sang their merriest song,
For the key was too high
And the notes were all wrong?
If you have, my dear friend,
Here's a bit of good news;
Go listen to Pearson,
He'll cure your blues.

— Gid. Martin

* * *

WHEN PEARSON READS

When Pearson reads — I seem to hear
Old-fashioned talk and country cheer;
I seem to read from Riley's books
Among green fields and running brooks;
And Riley's kindly people walk
Before my eyes and quaintly talk —
When Pearson reads.

II

When Pearson reads, — I seem to hear
Old Southern songs that echo clear;
And o'er me murmur soft and far
The tender lyrics of Dunbar,
In wistful dreams I seem to see
The darkies dance with merry glee —
When Pearson reads.

III

When Pearson reads — I seem to know
The inner heart of Edgar Poe;
The pathos of his tragic years,
The pity of it, that moves to tears.
I seem to walk that wondrous shore,
Where dwells the shade of lost Lenore,
When Pearson reads.

Old memories of vanished years,
Old recollections dimmed with tears,
Old Joys and griefs that had their part
In life's best hours surge round the heart —
When Pearson reads.

— John Russell Hayes

V

But there came an end to the Chautauqua. There came good roads by which small towns could get to big cities quickly. There came motion picture theatres and there developed the radio. Finally, in the 1930's there came the depression. All of these combined to put the Chautauqua out of business. Its great need ceased to be.

My father and Harry Harrison of the Redpath Chautauquas worked with George Perkins, a member of the J. P. Morgan firm, to create a foundation to continue the general principle of bringing famous speakers to small communities. At one time they had pledged a million dollars from Perkins to set up a foundation; but their negotiations failed. They broke up on just one issue. Perkins wanted to control the thinking of the speakers. My father and Harry Harrison refused. They wanted a foundation that would stimulate free thought — not controlled thought.

So there came a period when I saw my father borrowing on his life insurance, selling his home and in the end forced into bankruptcy by the change in modern transportation, modern movies and modern electronics.

The latter part of my father's life was spent as Governor of the Virgin Islands, the first civilian governor in its history. He served from 1930 until 1934. Even in the Virgin Islands his unquenchable

desire to inform people through speech prevailed and to some extent got him into trouble. The Virgin Islands at that time had been called by President Herbert Hoover an "effective poor house." Father endeavored to transform those lovely islands to a tourists' mecca. They are such today. But it took great imagination and an uphill battle to make them so.

One of Father's ideas was to bring pianos and musical instruments to the Virgin Islands and not only to create an atmosphere of happiness, but also to stage an annual festival there which would attract tourists. When he begged and borrowed pianos and musical instruments from his friends in the continental United States and sent them to the Islands he was criticized because it was charged he had used government transportation to pay for them.

He built a hotel, the first tourist hotel on the Islands. He revitalized the sugar industry and even created a rum company. His Quaker friends in Philadelphia never forgave him for this. But he argued that one of the main exports of the Virgin Islands in the past had been rum and so he set up a government corporation to produce rum and even brought a cask of rum as old as Franklin D. Roosevelt back to the then President. Roosevelt, I might add, started to sample it in the White House. And when Marvin McIntyre rushed out to bring him a glass, Roosevelt said, "No, this is the way to do it," and he tilted the flask up like a professional. The rum was exactly sixty years old.

However, aspiring Democrats coveted the governorship of the Virgin Islands and my father was a Republican. After four years he retired. I am prejudiced, of course, but today there's a beautiful monument in the form of a new housing project in his name in the Virgin Islands and if you go there as a stranger, I think you will find that the name of Paul M. Pearson is revered as the Governor above all the rest.

Father's closing years were spent in charge of public housing in what was then the very new government housing program. He pioneered the first public housing units in such difficult cities as Charleston, S. Carolina, Chicago, and San Francisco; and he paved the way for integrated housing in northern cities. He was even able to pass a new housing law through the California legislature, a State which hitherto had banned public housing.

Somebody had told him that you couldn't build any public housing in California. The law forbade it. But all his life the founder of your Association had been guided by the philosophy expressed in an old poem by Edgar Guest, "It Can Be Done." He had read it to thousands of audiences, he had delivered it to his family, he had quoted it to his co-workers when they ran up against obstacles.

It represented his philosophy.

IT CAN BE DONE

Somebody said that it couldn't be done,

But he with a chuckle, replied

That "maybe it couldn't," but he would be one

Who wouldn't say so till he tried.

So he buckled right in, with a trace of a grin

On his face. If he worried he hid it.

He started to sing as he tackled the thing

That couldn't be done — and he did it.

Somebody scoffed: "Oh you'll never do that;

At least no one ever has done it."

But he took off his coat and he took off his hat,

And the first thing we knew he'd begun it;

With the lift of his chin, and a bit of a grin,

Without any doubting or quiddit,

He started to sing as he tackled the thing

That couldn't be done — and he did it.

There are thousands to tell you it cannot be done;

There are thousands who prophesy failure;

There are thousands to point out to you, one by one,

The dangers that wait to assail you.

But just buckle in with a bit of a grin;

Then take off your coat and go to it;

Just start in to sing as you tackle the thing

That "cannot be done" — and you'll do it.

—Edgar A. Guest

And so, applying this philosophy to public housing, the founder of your Association passed a new law through the State of California. He was not a resident of California. He had to buck the real estate lobby, which fought against public housing. But he camped out in the lobbies of the California Legislature until the bill was passed. He did the thing that couldn't be done. And having done it, just as the bill was being signed in March 1938, he too passed on to another world.

Modern Poetry and a Kat Called Krazy

by Ralph Pomeroy

Professor Pomeroy, of the Department of English, Dramatic Art and Speech, University of California at Davis, presented this paper as an introductory address to a poetry reading at Davis. Cf. John Newman's "The Meanings of Poetry," *TODAY'S SPEECH*, September, 1958.

A POET," ACCORDING TO WALLACE STEVENS, "looks at the world as a man looks at a woman." As a bare statement of resemblance, this is striking but not too enlightening. How does a man look at a woman? It all depends on the man — and, of course, on the woman.

Let's consider the analogy a little further, though; there's a sense in which it becomes relevant to our understanding of poetry in general and of "modern poetry" in particular. Here, the relevance comes from our recognition of what the poet characteristically tries to do with his world.

A poet, we can say, looks at the world and scrutinizes its possibilities for love. He wants to discover not only the love the world freely gives, but also the love it has been (until then) withholding. To him, the world is a woman with many suitors — most of them unworthy and unsuccessful. Although he knows he too may be unworthy (not to mention unsuccessful), he has to try gaining an audience with her. He has to present his qualifications and make his play. Beyond warrant of reason he assumes that nothing in his world is intrinsically unlovable. In assuming this, he may be wrong; but neither he nor we can be sure of that — at least, not until all the proofs and all the poems are in. So he goes on making the unwarranted assumption. He makes it day after day, line by line, poem by poem.

These considerations may prompt us to accept Stevens' analogy as a "telescoped description" of the world of poetry. It is a description not confined to any period or type of poetry. If we wish, we can fit it to *Piers Plowman* as well as *Four Quartets*, to *A Valediction: Forbidding Mourning* as well as *Sailing to Byzantium*, to *The Prelude* as well as *Paterson*. We can go even further. We can fit it

either to the poet's incredible courtship — his determination to treat each poem as what William Carlos Williams calls "a field of action"² — or to the reader's hoped-for marriage of "music" with "meaning." In any case, that woman representing the world of poetry comes always, when she comes at all, decked out with desirable difficulties. On her suitors she makes all kinds of demands, especially that they be persistent, attentive, and impervious to the trumped-up charge that "all women are the same."

How does this woman appear today? What, in other words, seems to characterize "modern poetry"? Or is "modern poetry" too rich, too various, and (as its detractors still say) too obscurantist to be characterized? When we talk about a world, any specification is risky; it must be partial and may be idiosyncratic. Nevertheless, I will hazard the risk. I suggest that the world of "modern poetry" (the poetry predominating, say, from Baudelaire, Hopkins and Hardy to the present time) can be characterized as the world of Krazy Kat.

Those of you who have read "Krazy Kat," George Herriman's comic strip of the '20's and '30's, will remember that world as distinctive, elusive, provocative: a strange amalgam of anguish and joy. In Krazy's world the landscape shifted without warning. We might begin an episode on the desert, albeit a desert with "modern conveniences." (Remember the little stand with umbrella akimbo and the sign "Lemon-Aide, Won Scent"?) Suddenly we move into a city replete with ashcans and barberpoles; or else a forest of saucer-eyed owls; or else . . . well, where next we never knew. We only knew *we would move*. To parti-

¹ Wallace Stevens, "Adagia," *Opus Posthumous* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1957), 165.

² William Carlos Williams, "The Poem as a Field of Action," *Selected Essays* (New York: Random House, 1954), 280-291. Cf. *ibid.*, 196: "I've been writing a sentence, with all the art I can master. Here it is: A work of art is important only as evidence, in its structure, of a new world which it has been created to affirm."

icipate in that world of movement-without-direction, of shift-without-preparation, must have given many of Herriman's readers "the shock of recognition."

Whatever the landscape, though, we always find Herriman's Three Fates: Offissa Pup, Ignatz, and Krazy Kat herself. Among a host of nondescript creatures these three define and inform their world. What do they represent? That's hard to say, because each represents so much and all at once. As a group I've called them the Three Fates — controllers of birth, death, and life — but each is too individualized to be labelled definitively. We know Offissa Pup as a bucket-jawed bulldog; Old Reliable, the Guardian of the Community and Protector of the Innocent (especially when the innocent is Krazy). We know Ignatz not as a mouse, a thing of trembles and tail forever, but as a *rat*: Public Rodent Number One — with a brick. From life Ignatz wants nothing more than to heave that brick; he revels in the accurate fling of a corrugate missile. Who gets the brick? Invariably, it's Krazy. But because the brickslinger is Ignatz, her lover, she accepts without protest his offering. Sometimes Offissa Pup blocks the brick — whereupon Ignatz, filled with "social protest," slouches off and Krazy mourns his going.

In this world Krazy herself is the great enigma. She knows herself only, and alternately, with Offissa Pup and Ignatz. Offissa Pup is kind, loyal, respectable: Krazy can live with him, but not for

him. She lives only for Ignatz — sly, irrepressible, a professional adventurer — but, love him as she does, she can't live with him. There's always the brick.

So from their own world they speak to us with a classic clarity. They stand in their own accomplished gestures, a rebuke and a revelation. Offissa Pup holds Krazy's paw, trying gently to lead her away; he points to Ignatz, saying: "Don't listen to him, he'll only break your heart." Krazy looks back at Ignatz with: "Darling, promise me you'll stay with me forever." Then Ignatz, fondling the brick: "Forever is a damn long time."

If, as I suggested at the beginning, we take the world of Krazy Kat as analogous to the world of "modern poetry," we can point out some features the two worlds have in common. Like Krazy's world, the world of "modern poetry" is richly upsetting; it is not necessarily the world we want, nor even the world we need, but it is a world we recognize. Krazy seems to motivate her world as the poet tries to motivate his; yet each world can often move far beyond the strict control — the adequate motivation that brings resolution — and court threat to win love. Whereas Offissa Pup and Ignatz, each in his way a dedicated specialist, have settled for one thing to the exclusion of the rest, Krazy suffers from a divided mind and heart: she loves Ignatz but she needs Offissa Pup. If she were otherwise, she wouldn't be Krazy.

How the Lawyer Uses Rhetoric

(Continued from page 8)

throws out a few remarks about th' flowers an' th' burrds an' asks th' twelve good men and true not to break up a happy christmas, but to sind this man home to his wife an' children, an' Gawd will bless thim if they are iver caught in th' same perdicymment."

Thus spoke Mr. Dooley — the crackerbarrel Aristotle.

To demonstrate how each principle of rhetoric applies to the law in this short talk is like trying to pour the Atlantic Ocean into a water glass. But it is a positive conclusion in my mind that the works of Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, and the other rhe-

toricians through the ages have as much value on a lawyer's desk and in lawyer's training as the Civil Practice Act and the Real Property Law. Not only the substance of the art of rhetoric, but the very discipline of its study is invaluable to the lawyer. The lawyer useful to society and his fellow man is certainly Quintilian's "good man skilled in speaking."

I'm sure that a knowledge of the principles and practice of rhetoric, will continue eternally to be useful to advocates, unless, of course, some legislative body takes it upon itself to pass a statute changing the laws of human nature.

Choral Reading Can Be Fun

by Earl E. Fleischman

Dr. Fleischman, Professor of Speech at City College, New York, has long been a leader in the field of Interpretation. See his article, "Oral Interpretation and the Growth of Personality," TODAY'S SPEECH, January, 1954.

IF YOUR ONLY EXPERIENCE WITH CHORAL READING has been as a listener and spectator, it may never have occurred to you that the reading of rollicking rhythmic words in concert with others has other possibilities than the "arty" performances you may have witnessed. Certainly choral reading in competent hands can, and sometimes does, rise to the level of a serious art. But for many people who look on and listen it often seems little more than a contrived elaboration of voices speaking words together with doubtful effectiveness, either as interpretation or entertainment.

Nevertheless, just as the average person may join with gusto in a community sing, so in a similar way does choral reading, the voicing of literature, offer unrealized possibilities as a means of having fun.

I

Here choral reading is turned over to the audience. All are performers. Everybody present joins in. The less gifted can lose themselves in the ensemble and be carried along in common participation with the rest. Their imperfections will tend to pass unnoticed as long as there are those who are able to strike out with confidence and a sure touch. There is no pressure to measure up to the standards expected by an audience in public performance. Seized with the spontaneous spirit that activates a "jam" session in music, such a group can be caught up in creative play with words and with the vocal dexterities involved in interpreting meaning.

To be sure, there must be a plan charted out in advance; the reading must proceed according to that plan. A capable leader is indispensable. He must know and appreciate the different forms and qualities of literature and possess enough creative imagination and inventiveness to see the possibilities of interpretative effects to be achieved.

Literature, as the word is used here, does not exclude those compositions that lack literary merit but may have a quality of humor, catchy rhythmic

lilt or deft human characterization. After all, in group singing we turn to the songs people like best—the familiar sentimental ballads, the tricky round songs, and the novelty phrasings and tunes that relate humorous situations. So what is wrong in choral reading with going "low-brow" on occasion and indulging in frivolous extravagances of wit and fancy? Certainly they lend themselves to that zest and hearty expansiveness that would make such adventures in group reading a hit with a group of amateurs.

As in community singing the leader must impart his own enthusiasm to the readers. Not only must he lay out the design to be followed but he must possess the knack of getting a lively response, of employing all sorts of resources to keep the ball rolling merrily along. Given such a leader, almost any group can have a "whale of a good time" vocalizing *literature*, or *verse*, or whatever name you wish to give the verbal composition you select for your purpose. Any type of lively composition with a strong rhythmic lilt, orderly structure, interesting human situation or story, and clear, expressive phrasing will lend itself to such treatment.

To make it "come off" some discipline and preliminary practice on the part of the reading group is, of course, essential. The meaning must stand out strong and clear. Crispness and accuracy in articulating words and phrases is indispensable. Timing to the split second must be achieved. Otherwise the effect is jumbled, a noisy babble signifying nothing. Coming in together precisely on cue as one voice, or signing off on the instant, as one part follows another in the sequence, keeping in step with the pace that is set, swinging the phrases with cumulative gusto, learning to modulate pitch, stress, and mood in the expressive tonal variety that is characteristic of animated talk, sensing the variations in timing that certain intonations of words and phrases require for the manifest intent of the meaning—these are the essential requirements. If you do not master these, the effect will be dull, jumbled, and blurred; and the whole

experience will add up to nothing either enjoyable or satisfying.

A chorus is still a group made up of individuals, and its success will depend, in the last analysis, upon the intelligence, the alertness, and the flexibility of each member. Each must bring to the coordinated effort a hearty vocal release, a child-like imaginativeness, an unabashed emotional fervor, along with some degree of interpretative skill. Entering into the game without reserve or reservation is an absolute *must*. This is *grown-up* play. Only by complete surrender to the imagination in the zest of pretending can the experience be imprisoned in the words be given a living demonstration. Each member of the group must be stimulated and stirred out of himself by the director until all self-consciousness disappears and he is eager to get into the swing of the reading and carry out the part assigned to him.

The all-over plan must be carefully outlined in advance before the group tackles the actual speaking of the words. With marked copies of the text in each hand, the director introduces the selection to the group, reading it aloud to acquaint them with its meaning, mood, and movement. By referring to the marked copy of the text he next lays out the plan with explanation and appropriate comment to indicate the structure of the piece, and the assignment that each reader is expected to handle. Each reader must clearly understand how the composition is put together. The director traces the steps in the forward-moving sequence, the essential details that constitute the points that must be made in the reading, the changes of attitude or mood, the transitions, the echoes, the returns to basic rhythm and theme as in music, the accelerations and retards of movement, the climax.

The plan is now put into action. With each one carrying out his assigned part, whether in concert with others or as a single reader, the piece is given a trial run-through to see that each one knows what he is to do. The director must give a strong lead with his own voice to set the pace and start the ball rolling. That done, the plan is perfected one step at a time. The interpretation grows a little with each run-through. Improvements and corrections are made. Smaller details are worked in — emphasis on single words, sharp contours for certain consonants and sound combinations, tone color, subordinations, ellipses, transitions — all the technical matters that make or mar the precision, the clarity, and the expressiveness of group reading.

Thus it is hammered and molded into the shape that was in the director's mind from the start. Now the channels of expression and communication are

set. Everybody knows what he is to do and how to do it. Now — *the real thing* — the *measured mile* at peak performance. At a starting signal from the leader you are off. Now the imagination takes over. The experience is everything. Each voice gives out in spontaneous response to the urging of inner impulse as the different ideas and feelings take shape in the mind. You let yourself go; you launch out boldly and with confidence; you taste the joy of voicing, along with others, your participation in a common imaginative experience.

This is what choral reading can mean. No audience is present. No problems of *getting over* to critical listeners intrude; no one is there to tell you you are making a fool of yourself. So who cares? You are doing it for fun. And *it is fun*.

II

Here is a group of men, say, having luncheon together week after week — Kiwanis, Rotary, Lions, or whatever. Or it may be a group of women belonging to the same lodge, church, or club. Or men and women together at a wedding anniversary celebration, a class reunion, a PTA. Almost any occasion that brings a homogeneous group together from time to time affords an opportunity for some enterprising and talented person to institute a program of choral reading. It will do wonders for group spirit. Then the "stuffed shirt" can be restored to the human family. Everybody can have a good time. Besides, many educational benefits will accrue as by-products for those who participate. Everyone's voice and speech will be enlivened and improved; creative personality will be liberated and permitted to grow and expand; sympathy, humor, and general responsiveness will be challenged; understanding and appreciation of the verbal art of literature will be enhanced. Nothing is more likely to develop a lively imagination, to promote the spirit of good-fellowship, and to shake people free from encroaching stodginess. Besides, it will bring its own reward in fun. And what is wrong with having fun?

Much of that enjoyment will come from learning how to respond rhythmically to the various verbal patterns to be found in the words you read on the printed page. The average person glances at the words, gets some idea of their meaning, and passes on. The sounds they make in the dynamic phrasings of speech echo but dimly in his ears and even more faintly deliver impulses to his speaking muscles. But with a little experience in choral reading words and phrases on the printed page come alive and a fascinating new world of speech is born with all the expressive nuances of the hu-

man voice and all the dynamic play of rhythmic impulses shaping the expression of the meaning.

Once having experienced the surge and sweep of speech in expressive literary art, the dynamic lift and swing, the suspensive arc of rising and falling tone progression, the charge of cumulative reinforcement, the expanding and subsiding that mark the release of inner impulses, the feeling of an unbroken line of continuity, the balance of thought elements arranged for counterpoint of tensions, the intensity of quiet concentration that makes pause and silence eloquent, the modulations and shadings of tone that express inner changes of feeling — these ever afterward become inseparable from the meanings that expressive language has for you.

With repeated association and practice these experiences of voice and speech become so familiar that you can size up a piece of writing very quickly, discern its intention, set yourself quickly to discovering what it is about, where are its main points, and what attitudes or emotional qualities are suggested and implicit in the verbal pattern. Thus, your reading skill and enjoyment will be immeasurably increased from your participation in choral reading.

This is the verbal art of speech that creative writers of literature rely on. And they rely on readers like you with fully awakened senses, imaginations that are ready to function, ears that have been tuned to the expressive speaking voice, to seize on the clues they implant in the printed text, and that are implicit in the human meanings it is their aim to impart.

Choric interpretation of the verbal art of literature should reach out to include some of the great poems of our literary heritage where we encounter as perfect an expression of the way we as men and women think and feel as has been composed by the mind of man. However, these present rather formidable difficulties for the average group. Most groups have neither the time nor the interpretative talents to rise to such high artistic levels. It is better to leave such material to thoroughly trained professional readers. After all, the group that wants to read *for fun* should choose pieces of relatively simple structure, easily apprehended meaning, strong story sequence, and lively expression. So let us pass up any piece that requires concentrated study or such complication of technical difficulties that for the average group it will become work rather than play.

III

Take instead a witty, playful, utterly frivolous approach to the problem of advising a young girl

when to say "yes," and when to say "no," as in the following bit of versifying by Agnes Rogers.

Here is how it goes:

LINES TO A DAUGHTER — ANY DAUGHTER

By Agnes Rogers

One of the things that you really should know
Is when to say "yes," and when to say "no,"
There aren't any textbooks, there aren't many rules,
The subject's neglected in orthodox schools.
You can't be consistent; there's often a reason
For changing your mind with a change in the season.

You may be quite right in *accepting* at seven
Suggestions . . . you'd better *refuse* at eleven.
Perhaps you'll consider these tentative hints:
"No," to a dirndl of highly glazed chintz,
"Yes," to a bashful young man at a dance,
"No," to the man who's been living in France,
"Yes," to a walk in the park in the rain,
"Yes," if he asks for a chance to explain,
"No," to all slacks unless you are thin,
"No," to that impulse to telephone him;
"Yes," to a baby . . . and "no," to a bore,
"No," if you're asked if you've heard it before;
"Yes," to a Saturday, "no," to a Monday,
"Yes," to a salad . . . and "no," to a sundae;
"Yes," to a stranger . . . (but use some discretion!)
"No," to three cocktails in rapid succession!
"No," if he's misunderstood by his wife,
"Yes," if you want it *the rest of your life!*
Remember, my darling, caresses and caresses
Depend on your choices of "noes" and "yesses."

Divide your group in half, designating section 1, and section 2. The division can be between men and women in a mixed group, or between light (tenor or soprano), and heavy (contralto or bass) voice timbres. The idea is to establish a contrast, or contrapuntal balance, between tones of light quality and those of more sonorous resonance, so that the swing from one section to the other will produce an interesting variety of tone change and provide a solid tonal reinforcement for underpinning, like the chords that give stability and strength in music. In directing the groups, refer to them as 1 and 2.

Have everybody read in unison the first nine lines of the statement setting up the situation. Then

(Continued on page 20)

SOME CALL IT GUTS . . .

by Frank E. Walser

This "project" by Professor Walser (Penn State Center at Allentown) is another in our series on "methods of teaching." We solicit from other readers descriptions of some pet project of their own — always remembering that any single project is but one of the manifold methods used by any teacher to deal with one particular problem his students confront.

AT THE END OF EVERY SPEECH COURSE I ask myself what is the last thing I can give my students. For, whatever way you look at it, Speech is fundamentally different from any other course. It holds some element of character training, much psychology, even something more that I would like to explore here, a sort of stamina or steeling of the will to think.

Fully half our students' future speeches or on-the-job speech will be impromptu or unprepared. It will be discussion, conversation, pertinent questions asked or answered, oral reporting on data observed — most of all, an immediate facing up to a problem suddenly presented by accidents, events, production difficulties.

If this statement is correct, the logical consequence is that we should spend more time than we do on impromptu speaking and round-table discussions (student-led). We should use impromptu talks for a thorough drill in rapid, concentrated problem-facing. (I exclude the completely impromptu speech or the voicing of the first thoughts that pop into mind, for this is mere triviality.)

Again and again life presents us with two or three choices, and the decision which to choose cannot be long delayed. Where in our years of education does the young American get preparation for making choices wisely and if need be rapidly, preparation anything like as thorough as the young Greek received for heroism in facing danger and death? As for the social scene, we need but watch newspaper headlines to see that our age is one of startling unsolved problems constantly poured onto the human stage, problems due largely to over-rapid scientific and theoretic discoveries, problems which may prove fatal if left unsolved.

When we check on ourselves we find that for many of our choices we have, or dare take in our

speeded up American living, but one or two minutes to think. Here is the point. *What can we do with two minutes?* Actually, they are a fortune if used aright. They can spell the difference between success and frustration. As we know, there are physiological conditions when the mind works at its best, conditions worth knowing and cultivating in so far as each can know and understand himself. But there is also a method of reasoning when we face new problems that can truly work wonders in speeding up the clarification needed for wise decision.

In our classes we take up impromptu speaking the last month of the course, for the two-minute impromptu talk may well be the most difficult kind to do well, inasmuch as the speaker must still watch his delivery weaknesses (tendencies) at the same time as he is obliged in large measure now to think on his feet. At no time in the course is he under greater pressure.

The method we use is based on the well-known facts of thinking. First, we establish with each problem the main facts of the situation presented (mostly facts given by the instructor in a minute and a half or less); then we determine as specifically as we can what the goal is or should be, a step which gives the best orientation to the mind as it now judges the facts. These two steps soon lead through judgment to the uncovering of the only practical alternatives for an action choice or solution.

Every student is supplied with a mimeographed sheet explaining the four-step method of facing facts, goal, judgment and action choice. We practice on three problems before starting to grade speakers. By using an oncoming auto crash (diagram on blackboard), difficult to avoid, as the number one problem, we point up the precise goal (such as not to kill self and other car's occupants, instead of the more general goal of avoiding a col-

lision). The second problem is about a sick child, and the third is about a semi-employed mother-in-law.

We use a list of forty-eight problems — every kind of problem, out of current political and international affairs, family relations, the unions, the use of our new leisure, the spread of flying as a hobby. Number forty is "Am I sane?" (Here sincerity is the keynote and both in 1957 and 1958 we got from this stunningly honest confessions of erratic behavior.) The instructor presents each problem dramatically. The students have two minutes to prepare, and they write their notes on a three-by-five card provided by the instructor. They must then talk from a minute and a half to two minutes, but need not solve the problem if they talk intelligently and helpfully about it.

The whole procedure is under the control of a student chairman we have trained in the preceding three months. Everyone, including the instructor, must obey his timing control.

Two more details belong here. Before calling on a student to speak, the instructor asks for volunteers (sometimes we get response, often not). In a series a student gets three chances to speak and the best grade of the three is the one that is counted. Brief oral criticism by the instructor follows each talk. We try to run two series, meaning six two-minute talks by each student.

Results are often fascinating to watch. In the second and third week, confidence in ability to face problems grows visibly. Much can be done by

brief suggestions after the procedure has become routine, if the instructor is something of a medical observer. For there is obviously tension during the short preparation, when no one knows who will be called on to speak. Students can be urged to relax in the final thirty seconds, to get perspective on their hastily written notes and to be in better shape to draw on their inventive imaginations. At times a student, too nervous, will begin, then run out of ideas and sit down. But an immunity to becoming baffled is more likely to develop, and this has its effect on the roundtable discussion.

Ours is an uncertain world, and no one knows what is around the corner. A fellow without mental "guts" is not made for it. The home and the school that entertain and protect and do not challenge the child are not in touch with the reality of this world. We may not like this bad word in good company, yet we rely on it for something that stays strong and firm under severest trial.

The capacity to face problems, to make hard decisions, and not run away from them; even the will to attempt the seeming impossible, with resolution and sustained tension, may be doubly important in an era when the "miracle" faith of positive thinking has become so immensely popular.

This then is what I must leave my students for an atomic age and a world of dogmas and dictators, leave them for citizenship as free men daring to think and daring to speak, in our climate of free discussion.

Choral Reading Can Be Fun

(Continued from page 18)

the fun begins. Group 1 reads all the "no" answers; group 2 reads all the "yes" answers. However, in every case, the rest of the lines, which explain to whom the answer is given, are picked up and read by the opposite section, the one that did *not* voice the answer itself. Every time a "no" answer is given by No. 1, No. 2 reads the rest of the line, and vice versa. This antiphonal criss-crossing effect, swinging from one section to the other alternately, interlacing the "yes" and "no" answers, continues throughout down to the last two lines, which are then read by the entire group in unison.

However, the pace quickens as you proceed. Notice that the phrases are short in certain lines:

"Yes," to a baby . . . and "no" to a bore . . .

"Yes," to a Saturday . . . "no" to a Monday . . .
"Yes," to a salad . . . and "no" to a sundae. . .

Finally, rock the boat in swinging back and forth through these lines. There is a brisk drive all the way with increasing momentum and vigor as the reading rises to a peak of vehemence on "No, if he's misunderstood by his wife . . ." and an even more vociferous "Yes, if you want it the rest of your life!" Then after a pause everybody reads the last two lines to bring this whimsical curtain-lecture to a spirited close.

It's for fun. So forget your dignity and pull out all the stops. Don't confuse boisterous noise with a rollicking spirit. But enjoy it; have the time of your life.

Organizing the Speech to Inform

by Phillip K. Tompkins

Mr. Tompkins (M. A., Nebraska) Instructor in Speech at The University of Kansas, presents one of his speech projects that has worked.

STUDENTS OF SPEECH HAVE LONG WRESTLED with the speech to inform. The problem has been how to arrange expository materials in such a way that listeners grasp the relationship of one point to another, and the relationship of each point to the whole. This problem confronts the executive giving an oral report, the professor delivering the lecture, and even the student discussing his summer-vacation.

For several semesters I have asked my students to evaluate each other's speaking performances. Invariably I find that the speaker selected for having demonstrated the best speech organization is also selected as having consistently delivered the best speeches. After observing this trend I began to pay more and more attention to my students' speech organization (even at the risk of being identified as "The Organization Man").

Recently the Director of the foundation Speech course at the University of Kansas, Professor E. C. Buehler, asked eight-four nationally known Speech teachers to rank in order of importance twelve factors that detract from the effectiveness of speeches. Seventy-seven of the Speech experts replied, and ranked "poor organization" as the third most detracting factor in speechmaking ("lack of substance" was first; second was "poor preparation" which perhaps overlaps with organization).

Interested by these data I began some casual experimentation in my Speech classes. Using a single criterion, retention of information, I began to compare the relative effectiveness of different methods of organization. After each student speech I asked the other students to write down the central idea and supporting sub-points of the speech. By comparing these with the speaker's outline I was able to determine which method of organization "got through" best to the listeners. Admitting a

lack of control over the data, I consistently found one method of organization more effective than all others in securing retention. This method is one of the oldest methods of organization known to speakers. In the first century A. D., the Roman rhetorician, Quintilian, explained this method:

Partition is the enumeration, according to their order, of our own propositions, or those of our adversary, or both; an enumeration which some think that we should always make, because, by its aid, the cause is rendered clearer, and the judge more observant and attentive, if he knows exactly on what point we are speaking, and on what points we intend to speak afterwards.

The trite epitome of the partition is the back-wood preacher's description of his method of organizing sermons: "First I tells 'em what I'm gonna tell 'em; then I tells 'em; then I tells 'em what I told 'em." This little monologue may be found in half of our speech textbooks; apparently few of their authors, however, seem to recognize it as a provincial abstract of Quintilian's partition.

For your next speech to inform, be it an oral report to the board, instructions to employees, or a lecture to your students, try Quintilian's partition: conclude your introduction with a *clear* statement of your central idea; restate your central idea and enumerate all your main sub-points in the order you mean to discuss them; discuss each sub-point in detail; use *clear* (even obvious) transitions from one point to the next to let your listeners know where you have been and where you are going; wind up your speech by simply restating or repeating your central idea and summarizing the sub-points of the speech.

If you use the partition for your next speech

to inform you will probably find that, as Quintilian said metaphorically, it:

. . . contributes great lucidity and agreeableness to a speech; for it not only causes what is stated to become clearer, by drawing certain particulars out of the crowd, as it were, and placing them full in the sight of the judges, but relieves the attention by fixing a definite termination to certain parts, as distances on a road, marked by inscribed stones, appear greatly to diminish the fatigue of travellers.

There are inherent limitations to the partition. It may be too repetitious for a five-minute address. Also, it is difficult to build suspense with the partition. However, for a lengthy speech to inform you will find that your listeners will have no misunderstanding of the single idea you wish to have emerge from the speech, your listeners will retain more of the information given in your speech, and you will find that the partition greatly facilitates your listeners' note taking.

A Visit With John Bright

by David M. Jabusch

Mr. Jabusch, a graduate of Oregon State College, is Instructor of Speech and Coach of Men's Debate at Penn State.

FRED FRANTIC HAD TO MAKE A SPEECH. Fred was indeed frantic. As he sat in the library wondering where to begin, he wished that he were a great orator. Certainly then he would not have to go through the agonizing process of preparing himself to speak. He wondered how those great orators of the past prepared their speeches. The very thinking about it made his head feel heavy and his eyelids droop. Suddenly, yet naturally as though he knew it would happen, Fred found himself in the drawing room of John Bright, the great British parliamentary speaker of the mid-1800's. Mr. Bright was seated in front of the fireplace chatting with a friend as Fred entered.

Bright: Hello, I'm John Bright. Won't you sit down? (Fred found a chair) Now what can I do for you?

Fred: Well, I have to give a speech and I don't know what to talk about. I read a real interesting article in *Readers' Digest*, the other day, do you think that would do?

Bright: (frowning) "Don't speak unless you have something to say, but, first of all, a real knowledge of the subject to be spoken of is required."^{*}

Friend: (breaking in) "Mr. Bright prides himself on the fact that he never makes a speech

for a purpose that he does not believe sound and true."

Fred: That sounds reasonable. What do I do next?

Bright: "When I intend to speak on anything that seems to me important, I consider what it is I wish to impress upon my audience."

Fred: You mean a purpose?

Bright: That's right, and in order to do this you have to know a great deal about your audience as well as the occasion.

Friend: "Mr. Bright even excells Gladstone in his analysis of the audience and occasion. Like Gladstone he places great emphasis on audience contact."

Bright: "You can't prepare your subject too thoroughly; it is easy to over-prepare your words. Divide your subject into two or three — not more — main sections. For each section prepare an 'island,' by this I mean a carefully prepared sentence to clinch your argument and then *trust yourself* to swim to the next island."

Friend: "He selects those few outstanding issues which he wishes to keep before his listeners, and he has a happy sense of what is enough to say to make his point."

Fred: That's fine for you, Mr. Bright, but how do you know what to say between "islands"?

Friend: (smiling) "In spite of a tendency toward indolence, he devotes time and energy with-

^{*} This and all subsequent sentences in quotation marks are quoted from Francis Feris, "The Speech Preparation of John Bright," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, XLII (1931), or Joseph O. Baylen, "John Bright as a Speaker and Student of Speaking," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, XLI (April 1955).

out stint to gathering the facts which embellish his speeches. His fondness for the Bible, Dante, Milton and Byron, . . . make these sources contribute to the material as well as the spiritual and poetic force of his oratory."

Fred: Well, I guess that all you have to do then is write it out and memorize it.

Bright: (shaking his head with a smile) "To write speeches and then commit them to memory is . . . a double slavery, which I could not bear. To speak without preparation especially on great and solemn topics is rashness, and cannot be recommended. I do not write my facts or my arguments, but make notes on two or three or four slips of notepaper, giving the *line* of argument and the facts as they occur to my mind, and then I leave the *words* to come at call while I am speaking. There are occasionally short passages which for accuracy I may write down, as sometimes also — almost invariably — the concluding words or sentences may be written."

Fred: (to the friend) Does Mr. Bright really give such terrific speeches without writing them?

Friend: "Preparation of his speeches most assuredly he *practices*, but evidence does not prove that they are written out and memorized."

Fred: You say he *practices* them?

Friend: Yes, "When he is home in Rochdale, he seeks out his friends, the mill hands and even the gardener to try on them his arguments and illustrations."

Fred: Then I can see that I'd better not put this off till the night before!

Bright: Certainly not! "When I am going to make a speech on a subject I care about, I lie awake three or four hours every night for *several* nights thinking about it."

Fred: Well that sounds like a good way to get ready to speak.

Friend: "The meticulous preparation of subject matter is inspired by Mr. Bright's resolve to abstain from speaking on subjects which [he] has not examined and well considered . . . and by his disdain for flimsy speakers."

Fred awoke with a start! He hadn't realized that even the great orators of the past prepared their speeches with great care! Maybe even in a dream he had learned something that would help him in his own speaking.

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY DEPARTMENT OF **SPEECH AND DRAMATIC ARTS**

COURSES OFFERED IN:

Public Address and Rhetoric
•
Speech Correction and Audiology
•
Theatre
•
Radio and Television
•
Speech Education
•
Graduate and Undergraduate
degree programs.

ACTIVITIES

Debate Council
•
Speakers Bureau
•
Speech and Hearing Clinic
•
University Theatre
•
Radio Workshop
•
Weekly Television Discussions
and Dramatics Series
(WHYY)
•
Television Workshop
•
Graduate Assistantships
available

ADDRESS: Chairman, Department
of Speech and Dramatic Arts

**TEMPLE
UNIVERSITY**
Philadelphia 22, Pa.

SEARCHING

by Elton S. Carter

Dr. Carter (Ph.D., Northwestern) Associate Professor of Speech at The Pennsylvania State University, illustrates use of the Socratic dialogue as one means (other than personnel inventories) of exploring the age-old question of the nature of a man.

Who are you?

My name is Ernest Cato.

Who?

Ernest Silvester Cato: Army Serial Number 31100357; Social Security Number 303-28-7234. . .

Names with numbers do not answer my question.

. . . citizen of the United States; husband and father; teacher, becoming an educator — Am I answering your question now?

No.

But my name does answer who I am: it does suggest an earnest, sincere, conscientious person (and I am *too* conscientious); the middle name, Silvester, does suggest the woods (and I am a person of the woods and in the woods); furthermore, as a namesake of Cato I stand for the fundamental importance of character . . .

Abstractions, with or without implications, are not living facts.

But my Army Serial Number and my Social Security Number are *unique* designators; they tell you who I am.

Not exactly: a name, or a unique name in the shape of numbers, does serve to pick you out of any crowd; but picking only you does not tell anyone who you are.

Then I try Popeye talk: "I am what I am."

Not much better: the only-you is picked out already; saying, "I am what I am" asks me to stare at you as a unique object, invites me to study you — objectively — precisely as a datum — isolated by distinctions. "How do you do" Ernest Silvester Cato, uniqueness personified, creature of my definition. Hence more of a creation of my own than your self.

My self?

Yes.

What do you mean by "self"?

Not what do I mean by it; What do you mean?

O.K., O.K.; What do I mean by "self, my self?"

Good question. When you learn how to answer it, perhaps you can tell me who you are.

(Later.) Hello, Mr. Cato. How are you today?

I don't know any more. How can I know *how* I am when I don't know who I am? Who are *you*?

Turning this question back to the asker does not solve the problem — not because I do not want an answer (that's why I asked) but because you are the only one who can answer for yourself.

You're dodging. I asked *you*.

Yes, I'm dodging.

Well answer me.

Why?

Because I will then take your answer as a model.

You can't do that in this case.

Why not?

Because I am a part of you: the part that asks questions.

O.K.; then I am the other part of me that answers questions.

You are? Then answer my question.

(Pause.) No. I'd like to be the question answerer, I guess; but you have confused me now . . .

How could I confuse you?

I don't know.

That's better. Realizing that you don't know could make way for learning. Perhaps this is the time to give you a clue: When you discover your self and thus answer who you are, then you cannot tell me.

Why not?

Because I will have disappeared.

(Later.) Hello, Mister Question Asker — Are you there?

I'm still here, Mr. Cato.

Call me Ernest.

All right. And you may call me anything you please.

I've done that already! My politeness with you is hypocritical.

With me? *Are you ever without me, Ernest?*

Yes, sometimes.
No, never. I am always with you, a part of you.
You couldn't get rid of me even if you tried.

Oh I've tried, believe me! I thought — I hoped — I had succeeded.

Yes, I know. That's why you failed. You may succeed when you stop trying and start living.

I don't understand that.

I mean that you should step aside of your own way. Perhaps, then, you could see your self.

If this made sense to me I would wonder how to get out of my way. I don't suppose it would do any good to ask you?

It might. I've been waiting for some such question.

You have!

Yes.

Then answer it for me.

I have not been waiting for that reason. Instead of trying to answer for you — which is literally impossible — I'll give you clues to help you answer for yourself.

You're a great one for clues.

Of course. Clues are my specialty, as you will discover for yourself when you learn how to listen to me.

I'm listening now.

The first clue for standing out of your own way

is to step, deliberately, all the more into your own way.

That's crazy?

Perhaps. But are you so sure that you have never done it?

You tricked me.

I did?

Yes. When I judged your clue as crazy, didn't I put myself in my own way? I blocked myself with my own barrier.

But not deliberately.

Not deliberately? Oh, deliberately. You say, that makes a difference. I'm supposed to trick myself. I've done that before. What's the second clue?

It has been said about art that the greatest difficulty in self-discipline is learning to the point of habit the principle of one thing at a time.

Now go teach yourself to put yourself in your own way deliberately.

Why should I?

In order to discover your resistances: those seemingly mysterious yet seemingly natural ways of avoiding the issues of discovering and learning, avoiding them by going blank, by "feelings to the contrary," by boredom, by any semantic reaction except spontaneous concentration with its attraction, interest, fascination or absorption.

CREATIVE DISCUSSION

by RUPERT L. CORTRIGHT and GEORGE L. HINDS, both,
Wayne State University

- presents concepts, techniques and skills of discussion and conference
- integrates speech and communication ideas with current administrative and social practices
- helps give an understanding of discussion in relation to all other approaches to group method
- questions, problems and suggested reading lists at end of each chapter

CREATIVE DISCUSSION consists of three main sections: *The Nature of Discussion* presents the underlying philosophy, contemporary usages and common procedures of discussion; *Techniques for Creative Discussion* considers the processes and techniques of effective discussion practice, including skills of speaking and listening and semantics; *Applications of Discussion* offers variations in practice as related to form, manpower utilization and personal involvements.

1959, 303 pages, \$4.50 (text edition)

*The Macmillan
Company*
60 Fifth Avenue, New York 11, N.Y.

P. B. RAWLEY

Distributor

A D C AUDIOMETERS

- Speech Recording; Speech Training Apparatus and Associated Equipment
- Complete Laboratory Service Including — Recalibration with Artificial Ear

177 Fairview Avenue Rutherford, N. J.
Phone: GENEVA 8-0299

A Phonetic Approach to Good Pronunciation SPEAKING AMERICAN ENGLISH by Gilbert Albert Schaye

Teachers of speech, students, and the general speaker will welcome this ingenious new text-workbook. The organs of speech are clearly illustrated as they are employed in producing the sounds actually used by the majority of educated Americans. Phonetic principles are described in detail in conjunction with numerous oral and written exercises. The flash-recall technique is adapted for the first time for use in speech training.

Several unique devices employed in the format of the book will aid in teaching and learning: the corners of the pages may be flipped in succession, visualizing the speech articulators; the pages are perforated so that they may be torn out for lesson assignments; and the sheets are loose-leaf punched for standard notebooks.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY PRESS
New York 3, N. Y.

I see.

You see while I wonder . . .

When the time comes for your third clue, it may be given in the form of this quotation: "everything that is not organic is ornament."

I'm beginning to enjoy this. Ever since our last conference a week ago I have been thinking about that quotation: "everything that is not organic is ornament"; you are a materialist and now that I've got you pegged . . .

That's an interesting resistance: very clever, subtle, ingenious and discouraging.

Why do you say that? Because I called you a materialist? I meant . . .

No; you may call me anything you please. Discouraging because you have not yet worked toward making your self more enjoyable before you short-cut yourself to enjoying as best you can your present self such as it is; because you must destroy me — that is to say, de-structure or analyze me to the point that my functioning disappears, leaving only my cadaver; hence you must destroy my physiology in order to investigate my anatomy in order to understand my physiology or functioning; for the sake of discovering your self, you must analyze me, take me apart piece by piece — it will kill me — Good!

I couldn't . . .

Fear not; for you must lose your life to save it — I mean, lose my life to save yours. And then the new person will be born.

All birth and no death eventually would be no different (except duration of misery) from all death and no birth. If you would be born anew — if you choose to grow — then you must murder me to save us.

I can think of nothing more repulsive. I'm certain absolutely that I could not do it.

We did not understand each other.

The teacher must be integrated, assimilated, become a part of your bones: the teacher — question asker, specialist in asking questions and giving clues — shall be transformed: when you become your own teacher, what happens to me? I shall disappear in my fulfillment when you destroy me.

I cannot destroy what I do not hate.

Then I must teach you to hate me . . .

I'm learning to hate you already, but . . .

. . . then, perhaps, you can learn to build your own integrity, learn to respect your self; and then, perhaps, you can learn to love others; and then, perhaps, you can enjoy your self.

I said, I'm learning to hate you already, but hate and murder are wrong. I should love even my enemies but — to be candid about it — I'm learning

to hate you because you *teach* hate, and worse — Oh, I hate the very idea of you!

How can you say that until you get to know me better?

Aw, you go to Hell!

Congratulations.

(Two weeks later.) Why did you congratulate me last time?

Because you seemed to express honestly an emotion, which is evidence that you acknowledged your anger without flinching; taking the responsibility for your self, you responded appropriately to that particular situation; but you did not hate me — I tricked you into saying that — you hated what I did to you.

Forgive me.

For what?

(Pause.)

You have no answer; now you're listening. In order to teach our selves to love one another, even our enemies, perhaps we need to learn how to hate the certain hateful things that some people sometimes do. To hate is indeed a sin — except to hate hate.

"The wages of sin are death; the wages of forgiveness are creativity."

You responded appropriately to the particular situation: hating what I did, you have been able to forgive me. You responded appropriately to the particular situation: this vital phrase points to the heuristic step that your response was conditional; when conditions change, your response might change: your response, not mine: "Everything that is not organic is ornament."

Not so fast, teacher, not so fast. Let's not get ahead of our selves again; I didn't enjoy it last time.

Congratulations again.

I have been resisting you and your shenanigans all week.

Good! Please pinpoint these resistances so that I can learn of the conditions under which they occurred. . . .

(Years later.) Occasionally I dream about you. I was standing on snow where walking had pressed it into almost ice, playing around on it with my heel, when you came along in my dream and asked me if I would like to study snow. I said no. You were disgusted with me.

Perhaps the snow represented "cold facts."

(Laughter)

I don't care a damn about studying snow, you know.

Yes, I know.

EAVES COSTUME RENTAL

COMPLETE COSTUMES

from \$5.00

F.O.B.: N.Y.C.

No Extras

FREE

- Costume Plot
- Money Saving Suggestions
- Information & Forms

a specialized rental service for

- Schools ● Colleges
- Little Theatres ● Clubs
- Lodges ● Church Groups and all other non-professional groups

Eaves Costume Co., Inc.

151 W. 46th, N. Y. 19

PL 7-3730

Costumes by



*On the
American Stage
over a Century*

**Send for Free Illustrated Costume Plot
and Rental Estimate for your Production**

*Costumers to the leading professional
and non-professional theatres in the East*

► **MODEST RENTAL RATES**

VAN HORN & SON
THEATRICAL COSTUMERS

232 N. 11th ST.
PHILA. 7, PA.

Rhetoric and Semantics

by John D. Newman

Dr. Newman, Assistant Professor of Speech at Queens College, an expert in both General Semantics and the oral reading of poetry, here launches into the area of rhetorical theory.

I

ONCE UPON A TIME there was a semanticist. (*The indefinite article is stressed here because, contrary to the beliefs of many of his enemies and all of his friends, he was not the semanticist. There were — and are — others.*) Now this semanticist developed a methodology which he called "non-aristotelian." There was nothing wrong with that. No known hagiology has even hinted at The Philosopher's beatification. But The Philosopher had true believers; and they considered themselves "aristotelian." And so it followed, according to their lights, that anyone who considered himself "non-aristotelian" must be not of their kind: a *Doppelganger*, a Mr. Hyde, an opposite counterpart or mirror image of themselves, as it were.

There was, after all, the precedent of the scientific rule known as The Principle of Conservation of Parity, according to which nature possessed a well-balanced quality of symmetry in which every existing object was balanced by an opposite mirror image that had to respond to the same law of nature. (*We, of course, are aware that in October of 1957 two young Chinese physicists were awarded the Nobel Prize for having destroyed experimentally the long accepted principle of the so-called "parity law."*) And so, it was reasoned, since there existed an "aristotelian" system of thought and along came someone who professed a "non-aristotelian" system, it followed that the two were opposites that had to respond to the same law of nature.

But it came to pass that there rose up a rhetorician. (*The indefinite article is stressed here for the same reason as before: there were — and are — other students of the Learned Lady of the Lily and the Sword.*) And this rhetorician proceeded to prove that that non-aristotelian semanticist was not non-aristotelian at all! In fact, he was as aristotelian as an aristotelian could be! For, in attempting

to convince various of his audiences of the validity of his system of semantics, that non-aristotelian semanticist used aristotelian rhetoric! Where was the non-aristotelian rhetoric the world was awaiting? Apparently there was none. Nor could there be one. For, in a rhetorical situation, even a non-aristotelian functioned according to aristotelian precepts! (*This appraisal is much the same as saying that there is no such thing as a pedestrian because in the attempt to walk from Brooklyn to Staten Island, for instance, such a so-called pedestrian must sit while being ferried across Upper New York Bay. Apparently one can not be considered a true pedestrian unless he can also walk on the waters!*)

The story might have ended here, except that the mirror image had to respond to the same law of nature.

And so there arose another semanticist, who, taking up his lance and mounting his warhorse, charged that the trouble with aristotelian rhetoric was that it was anti-semantic! When this joust did not unhorse the rhetorician, later semantic champions contended that aristotelians "misunderstood the meaning" of the *non* in "non-aristotelian." Non-aristotelian, they explained, did not mean anti-aristotelian. But by this time the lines were so sharply drawn and the barricades were piled so high that the double, triple, and quadruple negatives just ricocheted all over the various quarterlies.

Most recently we have been told that semantics is meta-aristotelian! That explanation, however, seems to have made matters worse instead of better, and the controversy seems to have become more and more costly.

Thus did the notion come about that rhetoric and semantics are antithetic. The upshot of it all is simply that semantics does not have a rhetoric and rhetoric does not have a semantics, despite the need of both for what the other can contribute to

it. Actually the relationship between rhetoric and semantics is complementary and should be considered catalytic rather than antithetic.

II

Rhetoric is rooted in an essential function of language itself: "the use of language as a symbolic means of inducing cooperation in beings that by nature respond to symbols."¹ Regardless of "whether we accept the habitual Roman definition of rhetoric as the *ars bene dicendi*, the art of effective public speech, or the more philosophical Aristotelian definition, the art of discovering all available means to persuasion in any subject," the two traditional functions of rhetoric have remained: "to attack and defend by verbal arguments and to embellish speech with verbal adornment."² Semantics, on the other hand, has been defined as "the study of the dynamics of meaning in language."³ Its functions are to describe and to analyze language symbols and the dynamics of their action and interaction in the various systems of human communication. There are, then, areas of mutual interest to both rhetoric and semantics, but there is no antithesis between them, there is no opposition.

Rhetoric operates in the area of the contingent, and is concerned with the choice to be made among alternative courses of action. Semantics operates in the area of the normative, and is concerned with standards of usage in language. Rhetoric is the rationale of persuasive discourse. Semantics is the rationale of meaningful discourse.

Perhaps mindful of this distinction, I. A. Richards dismisses the old theory of rhetoric considered as the rationale of persuasive discourse and suggests an approach "which endeavors to look into the structure of the meanings with which discourse is composed, not merely into the effects of various large-scale disposals of these meanings."⁴ This "new rhetoric" is "concerned, not with persuasion as a specific end, but with the meanings of statements in any type of discourse."⁵ Rhetoric has always been concerned with the meaning of the language of the work in question. Perhaps its "newness" may be measured in direct proportion to the degree with which it is concerned with semantics.⁶

But there's the rub! Rhetoric is a formal language activity structured so that its art may rein-

force its argument. To be effective, however, an argument must have "meaning." But arguments "do not carry 'meanings' tied around their necks, like labels round pots of jam. 'Meaning' is more like the beauty of a complexion; it 'lies altogether in the eye of the beholder' — but changes with the light!"⁷ The art of an argument, which unquestionably fosters its effectiveness, will not be obvious when the argument has "meaning," for it will have blended into the background as reinforcement. But where the argument is not "meaningful," it will, for all intents and purposes, have no existence as such. The art of such a statement, its ornamentation and verbal adornment, will then become obvious: there will be "no background" for it to blend into, no argument for it to reinforce. Any verbal activity, any rhetorical statement, which is not "meaningful," then, becomes "mere rhetoric."

Now certainly this is no revelation. There have been writers over the centuries, Aristotle among them, who have felt that content is the most important part of rhetoric. And so they gave more attention to its inventive aspect than to its other parts on the grounds that style without adequate invention produces a rhetoric of display and, conversely, that a rhetoric with adequate invention is a "meaningful" rhetoric. But though the facts in any given case may make up the only truly adequate subject matter, facts alone do not necessarily make for effectiveness in persuasion. And here lies an essential dilemma in persuasive discourse.

Though it may be primarily concerned with effecting persuasion, rhetoric requires, depends upon, and indeed exists because of language and verbal activity. And verbal activity is highly redundant: at least as redundant as the language system of which it is a part. The redundancy of English, for example, is estimated at about fifty per cent.⁸ The essence of persuasion, its methods and stylistics, demands redundancy, repetition, restatement, and recapitulation by various means and in various ways. In evaluating the persuasive efficiency of a speech, for instance, the rhetorical critic looks for the speakers' manners, methods, and style of verbal activity in these as well as other regards.

What would a critic oriented to such a view think of a proposal to control the stylistics of rhetoric by reducing its language activity to a basic vocabulary of a few monosyllabic referents? What is the reader who has come to appreciate the great

¹ Kenneth Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives* (New York, 1952), p. 43.

² Donald Lemen Clark, "Rhetoric and the Literature of the English Middle Ages," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, XLV (1959), 18-19.

³ John B. Newman, "The Area of Semantics," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, XLIII (1957), 155.

⁴ *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* (New York, 1936), p. 9.

⁵ Marie Hochmuth, "I. A. Richards and the 'New Rhetoric,'" *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, XLIV (1958), 9.

⁶ See Newman, p. 162.

⁷ Colin Cherry, "Communication Theory" — and Human Behaviour," *Studies in Communication*, ed. A. J. Ayer et al. (London, 1955), p. 67.

⁸ Claude E. Shannon and Warren Weaver, *The Mathematical Theory of Communication* (Urbana, Illinois, 1949), p. 104.

works of literature to think of a "translation" of Plato's *Republic* or the King James Version of the New Testament into a glossary of five hundred simple words? Works such as these are not meant for the training of primary readers, as is, for instance, Dr. Seuss' latest juvenile, which is purposefully rendered in less than two hundred and fifty words so that it can be shown that any third-grade Johnny can so read! Works like Plato's *Republic* and the King James Version of the Bible are great literature. No small factor in their greatness is their use of stylistic devices and their well-wrought phraseology. Indeed, "even the most casual observer would find Basic English unsatisfactory as a vehicle for English literature."⁹

III

How does the semantic critic work? He attempts, first, to cut down to what he considers the bone, the heart, the core of the piece. He is after the mathematical equation of the information in the work. (But this is not to say that Shannon and Weaver are entirely to blame, for Edna St. Vincent Millay's "Euclid alone has looked on Beauty bare" preceded them by a generation.) Then, having found its bare beauties, having ascertained that its "maps" fit its "territories" and that its symbols refer to its referents, he feels that he "knows the meaning." And thus knowing its mathematics and its cartography, he concludes, with Alexander Pope, that "plain truth . . . needs no flow'rs of speech"; for apparently anything more than the bare meaningful bones of discourse is verbal adornment and mere rhetoric.

Aldous Huxley regards rhetorical adornment as a cloak of words which may mask a dagger of meaning.¹⁰

Words can exercise an almost magical power over their hearers. Because of the essential irrationality of this power, even the best-intentioned of public speakers probably do more harm than good. When an orator, by the mere magic of words and a golden voice, persuades his audience of the rightness of a bad cause, we are very properly shocked. We ought to feel the same dismay whenever we find the same irrelevant tricks being used to persuade people of the rightness of a good cause. The belief engendered may be desirable, but the grounds for it are intrinsically wrong, and those who use the devices of oratory for instilling even right beliefs are guilty of pandering to the least creditable elements in human nature. By exercising their disastrous gift of gab, they deep-

en the quasi-hypnotic trance in which most human beings live and from which it is the aim and purpose of all true philosophy, all genuinely spiritual religion to deliver them.

Northrop Frye goes so far as to claim that "the measured cadences" of such "historical oracles" as *Areopagitica*, some of Burke's speeches, Lincoln's Gettysburg address, and Churchill's 1940 speeches, among others, as well as "the prose of so much Victorian criticism, of several acres of Carlyle and Ruskin," in fact of "nearly all rhetoric in which we feel that the author's pen is running away from him," leads inexorably from "an obsessive repetition of verbal formulas" to "the kind of vulgar inarticulateness that uses one word, generally unprintable, for the whole rhetorical ornament of the sentence" until, finally, "words disappear altogether, and we are back to a primitive language of screams and gestures and sighs."¹¹

Now the writer of such an appraisal is rather short-sighted. (There might even be some question as to whether he can see as far as the walls of his own house.) Certainly he is aware that changes take place historically in the meanings of words.¹²

When Francis Bacon referred to various people in the course of his *Essays* as *indifferent*, *obnoxious*, and *officious*, he was describing them as "impartial," "submissive," and "ready to serve." When King James II observed that the new St. Paul's Cathedral was *amusing*, *awful*, and *artificial*, he implied that Sir Christopher Wren's recent creation was "pleasing, awe-inspiring, and skilfully achieved." When Dr. Johnson averred that Milton's *Lycidas* was *easy*, *vulgar*, and therefore *disgusting*, he intended to say that it was "effortless, popular, and therefore not in good taste."

Styles of rhetoric change in much the same way. Just as the spelling of a word may remain the same until its meaning changes as part of the continual process of change in language, so the orthography of rhetorical styles may remain the same while their sense, feeling, tone, and intention change as part of the same process. What sounded convincing, sincere, and effective a hundred or even fifty years ago may sound prolix, pedantic, and bombastic today. The study of historic models can thus be confusing to the semantically unsophisticated or insensitive critic. Willa Cather said that she read a passage from the Bible to start her off on each day's writing task. She did this, she made clear, not from piety, but to get in touch with fine prose.

⁹ Joshua Whatmough, *Poetic, Scientific and Other Forms of Discourse* (Berkeley, California, 1956), p. 151.

¹⁰ *The Devils of Loudon* (New York, 1953), p. 18.

¹¹ *Anatomy of Criticism* (Princeton, 1957), p. 327-328.

¹² Simeon Potter, *Our Language* (Harmondsworth, 1951), Pelican Paper Book, p. 116.

"HIDE AND SEEK"

Activities Kit

by

Ruth M. FitzSimons, Ed.D.
Head Speech and Hearing Therapist
Public Schools
Warwick, Rhode Island

Albert T. Murphy, Ph.D.
Professor of Speech and Hearing
Speech and Hearing Center
Boston University

LET'S PLAY HIDE AND SEEK is bound in sturdy board 14" x 17", with wire spiral binding to form an attractive easel for convenience in handling and carrying. It is designed for use with children from six to nine years. Its extension upward depends upon the individual child.

The ten illustrations in LET'S PLAY HIDE AND SEEK are reproduced from original water colors by Ruth Beaton, a professional artist. Mrs. Beaton's work evokes a warm response in children as well as in adults. The simplicity and the realism of her arrangements never fail to delight her child audiences.

These illustrations, on heavy colored paper, depict different situations of appeal and interest to children. They cover the practice sounds **f, v, sh, th, l, s, z, r, ch, j**, with **s** and **z** combined on one illustration. Interspersed and "woven" into each large illustration are small pictures of words which begin with each of the practice sounds listed above. A total of 129 of these little pictures invite the children to play HIDE AND SEEK for the 11 practice sounds.

For the child, the picture search is an interesting and satisfying vehicle for ear training under a meaningful, conversational structure, offering the child immediate reward. The little pictures

which are hiding are placed as integral parts of each large illustration. In keeping with the wide range of ability represented among speech and hearing handicapped children, some of the little pictures are placed in easy to find locations while others are placed in more difficult to locate placements, providing challenge for children of different maturity levels. A set of symbols, representing the 11 practice sounds, are provided. These symbols are for insertion in the window which appears on one of the pages of LET'S PLAY HIDE AND SEEK.

The Manual for LET'S PLAY HIDE AND SEEK contains 128 original riddles in rhyme to accompany that number of little pictures which are located throughout the large illustrations in the easel. The riddles are simple, yet curiosity arousing, and their appeal is centered in the child's world of fact, fancy, and facetiousness. The Manual includes instructions, descriptions, and word stimuli for each illustration.

A workbook, GUESS WHAT!, presents 129 additional riddles and 129 pictures, utilizing the 11 practice sounds. The reading vocabulary used in the riddles is on a first grade reading level, and is controlled for meaning as well as for vocabulary which falls within the primer and first reader levels.

LET'S PLAY HIDE AND SEEK, with Manual	\$6.00
GUESS WHAT! (Workbook)	\$1.00

EXPRESSION COMPANY, Publishers
Magnolia, Massachusetts

But she also regretted that she had formed the habit, for the prose style and prose rhythms of 1611 were not those she was in search of. The rhetorical critic may well suffer the same dilemma.

Meaning, however, does not remain unscathed. It is neither sacred nor entire. Among other things, meaning must be distinguished from reference. The meaning of a word may be expressed by some other word or words, or by a symbol; but reference can be expressed only by a sign. "A sign has a direct relation to its object, like water dripping from the trees as a sign of rain; but the word *rain* (which is not rain, nor a sign of rain) is a symbol of 'rain' or 'raining.'"¹³ *Morning star* and *evening star* have different meanings but, since both symbolize the same physical entity (have the same referent), they are simply two ways of saying the same thing.¹⁴ Frequently, in literary and rhetorical discourse, "different morphemes are merely homonyms."¹⁵

IV

It has been said that language continually chases its tail. The meaning of a term can only be defined in other terms; and however we transform statements, we can but follow a perpetual circle. The rules of syntax alone cannot give up "the ultimate intuitive residue."¹⁶ We have, for instance, become so accustomed to the rules of use of such logical terms as *is*, *is not*, *and*, *or*, *if*, etc., that we can readily carry out deductive argument using non-sense terms which denote nothing in particular. For instance, the syllogism

All hoodles are snurds
This gabooze is a hoodle
Therefore, this gabooze is a snurd

is as "meaningful" as, say, an algebraic equation, where the *x* and *y* symbols do not denote specific referents. Yet *hoodles* and *snurds* are terms that could be defined by other terms, so could have "meanings," though they would have no referents.¹⁷ "The only road from grammar to logic . . . runs through the intermediate territory of rhetoric."¹⁸ But that does not free the rhetorical critic from concerning himself with both grammatical meaning and logical reference.¹⁹

Consider, for instance, the rhetoric of the syllogism:

No Eskimo is blond
Some Germans are blond
Therefore, some Germans aren't Eskimos.

This syllogism, of the Mood *Festino* in the Second Figure,²⁰ contains the required factors in proper distribution and so is valid logically, despite the fact that it is somewhat distressing rhetorically. Logicians symbolize it as

PeM
SiM
—
SoP

in order to prove its logical validity, precisely because they are aware of its rhetorical confusion. Logicians, concerned primarily with relationships, may avoid the rhetorical confusions of "natural language" by creating exact, artificial ones; but the writer or speaker must deal inexorably with "every-day speech" and "the language of the people," and so must cope with all of the various linguistic and rhetorical pitfalls which can result from their use. Laocoon had only to disentangle himself and his sons from a few snakes; but the writer or speaker must disentangle his every statement from every word and word-construction he uses!

The imminent ambiguity of natural language is clearly evident in the conclusion of the syllogism quoted above. As it is *stated*, one could infer that if *some* Germans aren't Eskimos, then others *are*. But this is not the intended meaning of the conclusion. What it means is that "Some Germans [to the extent that they are blond — which characteristic alone, in this case, excludes them from the group called Eskimos] aren't [therefore] Eskimos." Such particularization of meaning may also be found in humor ("I don't know what my father died of, Doctor, but it was nothing serious"), poetry ("And nightly under the simple stars/As I rode to sleep the owls were bearing the farm away"), or any other form of utterance depending upon or making use of ambiguity in language.

V

Though it can act as a catalyst for rhetoric, semantics cannot replace or supersede it. And just as semantics does not become rhetoric because it happened to produce "a rhetorical reaction," neither does rhetoric become semantics because it has reacted to a semantic catalysis. So far as verbal activity, which is the stuff of rhetoric, has to do with the dynamics of meaning — and if it does not, it is "mere rhetoric" — to that extent has semantics "appropriated" those parts of rhetoric traditionally considered to have been exclusively its own, and

¹³ Whatmough, p. 116.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 123.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 122.

¹⁶ Colin Cherry, *On Human Communication* (New York, 1957), p. 252.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ Frye, p. 331.

¹⁹ Whatmough, p. 123.

²⁰ See, for instance, Roger W. Holmes, *The Rhyme of Reason* (New York, 1939), esp. pp. 54, 64, 74, 76-77; and M. H. Hepp, *Thinking Things Through* (New York, 1956), esp. pp. 216n and 239n.

²¹ The contracted form "aren't" (or "isn't") is adopted as standard in logic, not for colloquial effect, but because it shows clearly that the negative is interpreted as belonging to the verb, rather than to the predicate class-name. See Hepp, p. 216n.

to that extent must rhetoric depend upon semantics for data that it cannot receive from any other source. Semantics, however, remains an agent, rhetoric the action, of language and communication.

Rhetoric, on the other hand, can serve to "popularize" the technicalities of semantics which may not otherwise be effective. Rhetoric, for instance, can broaden the scope of semantics. The dynamics of meaning may be one separate subject, but "language" is not. "Language" includes the process of communication (*language*), the phenomenon of dialect (*langue*), and the activity of speech

(*parole*). These separate meanings are frequently run together in dealing with the concept. As a result, many scholars mistakenly identify their special area of interest in "language" with the whole field thereof.

Rhetoric, then, can apply semantics in its dealings with verbal activity, language usage, and communication processes, whereas semantics may be said to hold a watching brief on rhetoric. Rhetoric and semantics both have need for what each can contribute to the other, and students of both fields may well avail themselves of what the other has to offer.

Certification of Teachers of Speech in Secondary Schools

The following petition, prepared by Dr. Paul D. Holtzman on behalf of the Pennsylvania Speech Association, and presented to the Department of Public Instruction, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, last May, is presented with the hope that it may prove of use to other committees in other states.

1. The development and improvement of the essential skills of reading and writing are universally deemed the province of the schools, both public and private, at the secondary level. Through state certification and rigorous student requirements the best efforts of boards of education, teacher training institutions, local administrators and teachers are aimed at these goals.

By comparison, at least, effectiveness in speaking and listening is left to the accidents of birth, family influences, and fortune. What person reading this statement would deny the influences and importance of his own speaking and listening in serving both himself and his causes — whether those abilities came by accident or training or both?

For an education system that has made available to all children, instead of just the privileged, an opportunity to develop effectiveness in those communication skills that he will use only one quarter of his communication time (reading and writing), this is a plea to encourage more opportunities for all children to be privileged in the

development of *all* communication abilities under competent guidance.

2. At the very foundation of a program for the certification of teachers is the assumption that all children deserve to have only trained and qualified guidance in developing their knowledge and abilities. Yet in *some areas* it is assumed that *anybody* who is available — regardless of training — may effectively teach speaking and listening, direct forensic programs, conduct theater arts programs, plan radio and television activities, etc.

It takes no special training to recognize clearly that writing and speaking are *not* the same — in process, language, situation, purpose, nor learning. Likewise with reading and listening. And in these cases, "common sense" is corroborated by an abundance of research findings in the areas of Speech, Experimental Psychology, Social Psychology, etc.

A state certification program, certainly, is designed to do its best to see that the abilities of teachers of other academic subjects are not left to accident. Yet Speech courses and activities, deemed

essential to the growth-in-citizenship and growth-in-effectiveness of high school students, are frequently assigned to persons unprepared by their education to provide the values sought. This is a clear denial of the very principle of state certification.

CERTIFICATION IN PENNSYLVANIA

1. Representatives of the Pennsylvania Speech Association, now with some 700 members, have long sought clear and concrete certificate recognition for teachers of high school Speech. For many years the State Department of Public Instruction has granted such certification but given no explicit recognition of the fact in official directives. This has led to much confusion and frequent disappointments when officers of teacher training institutions have been unaware of this cloudy practice.

2. Pennsylvania children, like children everywhere in a free society, need study in speaking and listening to assure their maximum effectiveness in achieving their goals and in being thoughtful, participating members of the Commonwealth. A clear, explicit and broadcast action by the State Department at this time will provide an appreciable step in the direction of having students with *less* parrot recitation to the shallow end of performing the utterance of meaningless words and *more* thoughtful communication designed to elicit specific responses in the world of adults.

3. In a recent study of "High School Speech in Western Pennsylvania," a survey of the schools in *only a five county area* (69% responses to a questionnaire) showed, "81 schools having formal courses in Speech," with 6,582 students enrolled; 55 schools participating in the Pennsylvania Forensic League; a total of 170 teachers directing extra-curricular work in Speech (debate, discussion, dramatics, radio, television, etc.). Fifty-eight administrators in this survey of a limited territory reported a scarcity of certificated teachers of Speech. Others reported plans to institute Speech courses in their schools within the next two years.¹

4. The Pennsylvania Forensic League, with its many participating high schools, needs the leadership of qualified teachers to make its programs and contests serve constructive purposes in the teaching of effective communication.

5. Members of the Pennsylvania Speech Association from teacher training institutions across the State report annual requests from high school administrators for teachers of Speech.²

¹ Tacey, William S., and Terry A. Welden, "High School Speech in Western Pennsylvania," *The Pennsylvania Speech Annual*, 1958.

² The Teacher Placement Service at The Pennsylvania State University reports 14 requests in 1958.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the following certification requirements be approved and adopted by the Pennsylvania State Department of Public Instruction.

Certification of Secondary School Teachers of Academic Subjects

Speech (27 semester hours)

a. The provisional certificate may be issued to an applicant who has completed twenty-seven semester hours in Speech, including work in public speaking, discussion and debate, radio and television, theater arts, and speech problems.

b. The preparing institution shall certify in the teaching of effective listening and speaking and of voice and articulation; it shall further certify a competence *to detect* and *to refer* for treatment pupils with clinical speech and hearing symptoms.

c. The preparing institution shall further certify proficiency in the use of public speaking, oral reading and voice and articulation.

Respectfully submitted,

Harold E. Nelson, President

The Pennsylvania Speech Association
(The Pennsylvania State University)

Thomas A. Hopkins, Executive Secretary
The Pennsylvania Speech Association
(Mount Mercy College)

William S. Tacey, Chairman
Education Committee

The Pennsylvania Speech Association
(University of Pittsburgh)

Robert T. Oliver, Administrative Council
Speech Association of America
(The Pennsylvania State University)

Paul D. Holtzman, President
Speech Association of the Eastern States
(The Pennsylvania State University)

AMERICAN THEATRE WING Professional Training Center

Fall and Spring Semester Courses for Beginners
ACTING—MUSICAL THEATRE—T.V.—RADIO—VOICE
DICTION—DANCE
also

Professional Workshops

ACTING—WRITING—DIRECTING
PRODUCTION & MANAGEMENT and
and

Youth Theatre Workshop

Saturday Classes. Boys and Girls, 8-12, 12-16.
Helen Menken, President, Guthrie McClintic, Drama
Jule Styne, Musical Theatre
Approved G. I. Bill, N. Y. State Bd. Education
161 West 93rd Street, New York 25, N. Y.
UN 5-0800

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY • Department of Speech

DEGREES

Bachelor of Arts

Master of Arts

Doctor of Philosophy

Fall Quarter	September 28 - December 18, 1959
Winter Quarter	January 4 - March 18, 1960
Spring Quarter	March 28 - June 10, 1960
Summer Quarter	June 20 - August 26, 1960
First Term	June 20 - July 22, 1960
Second Term	July - August 26, 1960

Undergraduate and Graduate Degrees in:

General Speech, Public Address, Theatre, Radio and Television
Programming, Speech and Hearing Therapy and Speech Science.
(Phonetics, Speech Correction and Education of the Deaf)

STAFF

Goodwin F. Berquist, John W. Black, Roy H. Bowen, Keith Brooks, Paul A. Carmack, George Crepeau, Walter S. Dewey, Mark E. Doudna, William H. Ewing, Wallace Fotheringham, Harold F. Harding, Richard B. Hull, Ruth Beckey Irwin, Robert J. Kibler, Franklin H. Knower, George L. Lewis, Richard M. Mall, John H. McDowell, Henry Moser, Sheila G. Morrison, Herbert J. Oyer, E. C. Reynolds, Richard D. Rieke, Donald W. Riley, Virginia S. Sanderson, Everett M. Schreck, Courtney P. Stromsta, Harrison B. Summers, William E. Utterback, W. Hayes Yeager.

Forty assistantships are available to graduate students in 1960-61.

Address inquiries to: W. Hayes Yeager, Chairman
Department of Speech
154 North Oval Drive
The Ohio State University
Columbus 10, Ohio

LARGEST HEARING SERVICE IN THE EAST . . .

Specializing in . . .

- HEARING AIDS
- SPEECH AUDIOMETERS
- FREE FIELD EQUIPMENT
- PSYCHOGALVANOMETERS
- GROUP HEARING AIDS
- TELEPHONE AIDS
- ARTIFICIAL EARS

- AUDIOMETERS
- INDUSTRIAL AUDIOMETERS
- AUDITORY TRAINING UNITS
- PORTABLE DESK AIDS
- CONFESSIONAL AIDS
- SOUNDPROOF ROOMS
- INDUSTRIAL EAR PROTECTORS

Representing . . .

- ★ ALLISON LABORATORIES
- ★ A. M. BROOKS (AMBCO)
- ★ THE FISHER RADIO CORP.
- ★ INDUSTRIAL ACOUSTICS CO.
- ★ MELODY MASTER (IDEAL)

- ★ THE BELTONE HEARING AID CO.
- ★ DEJUR AMSCO CORP.
- ★ GRASON-STADLER CO.
- ★ LANGUAGE MASTER
- ★ REMLER COMPANY (Scottie Phone)

J. W. MANNY, INC.

48 East 43rd Street
New York, N. Y.
MU 2-7955

1 Nevins Street
Brooklyn, N. Y.
UL 5-5645

943-945 Coney Island Ave.
Brooklyn, N. Y. (Flatbush)
UL 6-3633
